CROUCH MEMORIAL
LIBRARY FUND

Accession No. _____

Date _____

LETTERS

TO

MR EWING,

RESPECTING

THE TABERNACLE AT GLASGOW,

&c.

BY

ROBERT HALDANE.

EDINBURGH,

PRINTED BY J. RITCHIE.

SOLD BY A. BLACK, J. OGLE, AND ALEX. JOHNSTONE, EDINBURGH;
J. & A. DUNCAN, GLASGOW; AND E. LESSLIE, DUNDEE.

1809.

LY73B
H12
Archives

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

PREFACE.

THE present is a time of great inquiry among Christians in this country, and many are halting between two opinions. In such a state of things, a variety of reports are circulated. Among these, the subject of the following letters has been misrepresented. It is in order that every thing concerning this matter may be understood, that the present publication appears. I have no doubt, that it will lead to a very full discussion of what has been doing among those with whom I have been connected for the last ten years; and I am well satisfied that this should be the case. Much advantage I trust will result from it, and many, whose attention will be roused, may be led to a decision according to the truth of Scripture on some of the important principles which it will involve. I exceedingly regret, however, the immediate occasion that leads to this step, and unfeignedly lament the offence to the world, and to Christians, which must ensue, not indeed from this publication, but from the previous knowledge among those connected with us, of a difference subsisting between Mr Ewing and me. In re-

19768

gard to myself, I have no fears as to the consequence. Unpleasant things may be said, and credit is not likely to be increased, when friendship is succeeded by variance. Yet it is of more importance to cure than to conceal evil. I have stood in a new and difficult situation; and am sensible, that in every respect I have come far short of filling it up as I ought to have done. In addition too to what may be justly impugned, it is in many cases hardly possible to prevent even unintentional misrepresentation. But it is a small matter to be judged by man's judgment. A better pledge, however, of sincerity, will be afforded by means of a discussion of this kind, than could have been obtained in any other way. Errors, imperfections and faults may be discovered; but integrity of conduct from first to last, will stand unimpeached.

N. B. Some explanatory notes are now added to the letters.

INTRODUCTION.

WHEN Mr Ewing left the Church of Scotland, I gave him the obligation which is referred to in the following Letters. This transaction between us was solely of a religious nature; it had no connexion whatever with any temporal concerns. It was entirely gratuitous, as I was under no previous obligation to Mr Ewing. The propriety and legality of the whole must therefore be judged of according to the nature and laws of that kingdom which is not of this world. Constantly keeping this in view, I have thought it right to state to Mr Ewing my conviction that he ought to give up the Tabernacle, and to remonstrate with him on the impropriety of his retaining it any longer. In doing this, I have been actuated by a sense of duty alone. His giving it up will be no pecuniary advantage to me in any respect, but the reverse. I have argued as with one who professed to take the Bible for his supreme rule, and who holds the possession solely for religious purposes. I ask back the property from the same motives on which I gave it. In all this I conceive that I do Mr Ewing no wrong.

Neither do I suppose that I am doing him any injustice in his temporal concerns. He will not be placed on a worse footing in respect to them than he stood on before. On the contrary, he has now many more connections than formerly, who I doubt not are able and willing to assist him. Mr Ewing's co-operation and mine began in consequence of our appearing to be of one mind; and now that this is far otherwise, it ought to cease. The deed itself binds us, to co-operate as long as we live in laying out money in the education of preachers, but it does not make any provision for future difference of sentiment. Without a violation of principle somewhere, this has become totally impracticable. Can any man wish, that in existing circumstances such an arrangement should continue? No plea of usefulness, no accommodation in worldly concerns, can justify such a desire.

I have heard nothing from Mr Ewing since writing these letters. I have been told that he has an answer to them prepared, but I have not seen it. I waited long to see what effect they would produce, and did not speak on the subject excepting to three individuals, who I hoped might be the means of at least doing away any ground of offence between us, if they could not put an end to our difference of opinion. It is only within these few weeks that I have mentioned it to others, after again endeavouring in vain to obtain a meeting with Mr Ewing, and after hearing that he was speaking loudly of my conduct to him as palpable immorality. Even had my behaviour been such, I might have expected, that in the first instance he would have used some other means. It is the duty of a Christian to turn away from those who have erred from the faith, but not, surely, till after affectionate and repeated warnings.

Conduct different from this appears to me to be altogether contrary to the gospel of Jesus Christ.

A report has been extensively circulated, that I was distressing some of the churches to whom I had lent money for their houses. I have received letters concerning this from England, and from the north and south of Ireland, and have heard of it from different parts of Scotland. It is not true in any shape, nor in one single instance. What it shall henceforth be my duty to do in regard to houses that belong to me, and the money that I have lent for such purposes, I shall endeavour fully to consider, and to decide I trust in the fear of God. I have noticed to Mr Ewing, in one of the letters, that I had heard he was propagating the above report. I hope he will not omit to notice this in his reply. If I have not been misinformed, let him avow what he has said, in order that the matter may be sifted to the bottom. Misrepresentation respecting many such things at present abounds. I am convinced that it is doing hurt to the interests of truth, and is made use of in many churches, as a handle against what I am firmly persuaded to be the will of the Lord Jesus. It is therefore a duty to endeavour to check it, which I now attempt by this publication. If evil exist among us, let it be detected, acknowledged and repented of; but the circulation of calumny ought to be repressed.

I am aware that the Lord has not taught his disciples to bring their differences before the world, but has commanded us to settle them privately, or to refer them to the church. The present publication may appear to be contrary to this precept. But when the many unsuccessful attempts I have made to get every thing between Mr Ewing and me amicably settled, are considered, together with the complete separation he has made between the churches with which we are con-

nected, it will be evident that I had no alternative. Mr Ewing has hitherto placed himself entirely beyond my reach on the ground that the scriptures prescribe. And as I have understood, that very strong language has been made use of on the subject of these letters, and on other subjects connected with it, I know of no way by which I can attempt effectually to counteract the bad effects of this but that which I have adopted. Neither let this be considered as the first publication between Mr Ewing and me. The personality of his book is well known; and although names are not mentioned, his aim throughout the whole is sufficiently understood. The mode of reproof and correction which he has adopted, is neither the most honourable nor conciliatory.

I am conscious, however, that I am not actuated by any spirit of animosity against him. I exceedingly regret the line of conduct he has adopted, and the extraordinary revolution that has taken place in his sentiments, since he and I became acquainted. It is my earnest prayer, that he may be brought to a different state of mind from that which he now appears to possess, and to views more congenial to those which he formerly had.

The first time he was in Edinburgh after his late publication, I invited him to my house, and treated him as I had always before done. Not having then an opportunity to speak with him particularly, I called at his lodgings in a day or two afterwards, in order to converse with him alone, both upon his book and the manner in which he was then acting in regard to the churches, which appeared to me to be in the highest degree disorderly, and also on the subject of his possessing the Tabernacle.

As he was not at home, I left a note to inform him,

that I would be glad to see him for the above purpose. He wrote an answer, declining to see me alone, but offering to meet me in company with certain brethren whom he named, while he proposed that I should bring such others along with me as I chose.

In reply, I wrote him, that I considered this to be contrary to the Christian law, and far from being so conciliatory a mode as the other; that I therefore still wished to speak with him alone in the first instance, and afterwards, if it was necessary, I would meet with him as he proposed, in the presence of others.

He answered that we had already conversed alone at Glasgow last year.

I reminded him in return, that his book, concerning which I wished to talk with him, was not then published, and that several other things had occurred between us since that time. To this I received no answer.

A few weeks after, I called on him at Glasgow, and on leaving him at his door, (there having been company in the room), I told him I wished to have a conversation with him. He replied that he would only agree to it on the terms he had before mentioned. I said I now wished to speak about the Tabernacle; and as he had relinquished the system on which we had set out together, I expected he would give it up. He observed that if I had any thing to state respecting this, I should communicate it in writing. I replied, this was not necessary; but he might consider what I had now said. Notwithstanding what had passed in Edinburgh, his declining a private conversation in the first instance on this subject was unexpected. He immediately retired, and I had no opportunity for further explanation. This happened on Wednesday, and as his behaviour during our interview appeared to me to be very impro-

per, and to require explanation, I wrote to him on Monday after, the letter, dated June 13th. Next day I heard that he had gone to Edinburgh, and afterwards learned that he went there to take the opinion of counsel on his legal right to the possession of the Tabernacle by the bond which I had given him.

To Mr Ewing.

MY DEAR SIR, *June* 13. 1808.

NOTWITHSTANDING the impropriety of your conduct, which does not appear to be regulated by that wisdom which cometh from above, I again inform you, that I am willing to meet and converse with you in the first instance alone, and afterwards if necessary (which however I hope it would not be) in the presence of others.

That you may not mistake my meaning in desiring this, I beg to inform you, that as there is certainly much evil betwixt us, independent of our difference of sentiments, my object is to comply with the rules of our Lord, Mat. v. 23, 24. xviii. 15. in order that by faithful but affectionate remonstrance every offence between ourselves may be done away; and that if we cannot co-operate in the service of the gospel, we may at least live the rest of our time in peace, and remove as much as possible any cause of stumbling out of the way of believers, and of the world. It behoves us, especially in present circumstances, with solemn awe to recollect these words, "Woe unto the world because of offences, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh."

In looking back on the intercourse you and I have had, I see many things amiss, on both sides, while I trust there is also cause for thanksgiving. But while we should be humbled in the dust on account of all that has been wrong, we should remember with gratitude that the door of mercy and pardon through a Redeemer stands open, and we ought to be ready mutually to explain, to repent, and to intercede for one another. Should the matter for the present unhappily end other-

wise, I shall regret it exceedingly, but I thus exonerate myself; and in order to make the return on your part to the path of duty, at any time afterwards, as easy as possible, I declare it is my determination through grace, that no sinful distance or interruption to the maintenance of peace and love shall in future rest with me.

I am, my dear Sir,

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT HALDANE.

To Mr Ewing.

MY DEAR SIR, *London, July* 29. 1808.

IT was with some surprise I learned that after seeing you in Glasgow, you had gone to Edinburgh, to take the opinion of a lawyer on the bond by which you was put in possession of the Tabernacle. Had you agreed to our conversing together as I wished, you would have found that my requisition to you to give up that house proceeded on grounds different from that of a legal claim. And I am persuaded, that when you properly weigh what follows, together with other considerations which will occur to yourself, you will see the impropriety of continuing to retain it. When I met you last year in Glasgow, you mentioned that what you chiefly felt in the view of the publication of your intended book, was your occupying my house. I am sure this feeling, proper and natural as it certainly was, must now be greatly increased.

The unreserved and unqualified manner in which I put that house into your hands, was certainly an unwise step, and evidently unlawful on Christian principles.

The former position requires no proof. In regard to the latter, it is clear that every man is responsible for the talents committed to him. It must then be contrary to duty, to transfer them to another individual, leaving to him during his life, their sole and uncontrolled direction *. In doing this I erred. It was sinful, for I should have known better. The only extenuation of my conduct, is my inexperience at that time in the Christian life. On the other hand, it may occur to you, that you left your situation in the established church, expressly with the view of obtaining this possession. But if this occupancy was in any respect the reason of your quitting the established church, it is much to be regretted that ever it should have been proposed, or that you should have acted for a moment on such a motive; and it would now be full time to evince to your own mind, the sincerity of your repentance, by renouncing what you had received on so corrupt a principle. I by no means, however, insinuate that this was the case. No doubt, the arrangements we then made, were an accommodation to you, and must have operated to di-

* The above remarks respecting the alienation of talents, does not comprehend the giving of property for immediate and definite purposes, such as the translation of the Scriptures, &c. It applies only to the transference of capital, which by the production of interest, or in some such way, continues its operation under any alteration of circumstances that may take place. In the first case, the direction is given to his property which the donor designs, and the application only is left to another. In the other case, the continued direction is committed to the latter. The person who thus alienates his talents gives up the power of performing with them what duty may appear to him to require according to the progress of events, and his own conceptions of the will of his master. This I consider to be unlawful both on the side of the giver and receiver, and contrary to the principles of Christian co-operation.

minish any regret you might have felt in quitting your former situation; but from the views you held of the established church, you must necessarily have renounced it, whether enlarged prospects of usefulness had opened to you or not.

If the transfer itself was not according to the rule of Christian duty, how far contrary was the manner in which it was vested in your hands. Does it not savour strongly of that worldly system which you had renounced, and how totally dissimilar is it to any thing we meet with in the apostolic writings. *In a stamped bond, and under a certain penalty, you oblige yourself to preach the gospel, and to dispense divine ordinances, and to levy and collect seat-rents and offerings at the door, as the tenure by which you hold your right!*

Besides, the way in which your salary is levied is by no means regulated by the Christian law. Instead of its being given to you by the church over which you preside, in obedience to the authority of Jesus Christ, and in token of their regard and affection to you, *it is raised by the whole promiscuous multitude which attends the place of worship, to many of whom the destination of what they contribute is unknown.* What you thus receive then cannot be said to come from the church. It was paid just in the same manner during the first twelve months before the church existed, and would continue to be so on the present constitution of things, if it were dissolved. From these considerations, I could not, as you wished, animadvert on the observations made upon you, two years ago, in the Liverpool Magazine.

The choice too and appointment of an *assistant minister*, are secured exclusively to yourself. Does not this "*amount to patronage* * ?" When you oppose a plu-

* Mr Ewing's Attempt, p. 107.

rality of elders as "*unscriptural*," where do you find your warrant for the assistant minister, not only chosen by yourself, but entirely dependent on you for his continuance in the office?

In regard to the church, they continue to occupy the house wholly at your pleasure. Is not this a strong temptation implicitly to submit, whenever you may chuse to impose or to withhold? Last year, you informed me of your determination to allow no discussion in the church on the subjects lately agitated. Yet you have not suffered them to remain as they formerly were. For in regard to exhortation by the brethren, you have removed them *in principle* entirely off the ground on which you at first placed them, by publicly declaring that they do not come together to attend to this duty as a church, but as a fellowship society. This is not the situation in which a church ought to stand in respect to its pastor. It is neither safe for them, nor right for you.

I would also remark on the assistance you give to build other places of worship, ought not the church to be taught first to *provide for itself?* Instead of this, if any thing is wanted to be done in the house in which they assemble, I am applied to, and asked to allow it from the surplus of income, which, by the stipulation in the bond, belongs to me; and not only so, but also to make up the shortcoming of the assistant's salary. Is not this taking with the one hand, and giving with the other? Would the continuance of such a system be either honourable or proper?

On the whole, I cannot help recognizing in this bond, a worldly establishment far removed from the nature of the kingdom of Christ. I am convinced of the unlawfulness of the whole transaction, both on your side, and on my own. It is unscriptural in its nature, involving

and perpetuating many abuses. It was an unlawful alienation of my proper talents, delivering them over to another, who was empowered to use them, however much, in my judgment, in opposition to the gospel, whether by resisting reformation, or by introducing positive evils. For if you should become an Arian or a Socinian, it would infer no legal forfeiture on your part. You have consulted law on this business, but if I should enforce what the bond authorizes me at any time to do, it might occasion to you some trouble. The monthly collections not accounted for to me, are contrary to it. An assistant minister, as the agreement provides, would not suit your ideas, and you would find yourself bound in the most express manner, to account for all the different collections, with the exception of occasional ones, made "in the house, or at the doors" of the Tabernacle.

Besides the grounds above stated, there are others which fully warrant me to conclude, that it must appear to you a duty no longer to retain the house, or to continue that aukward connection in which it places you and me. You declare it is now high time to change your course, and you blame yourself and the churches for depending on an institution supported by an individual for the education of preachers; and you call on them to come forward to join with you, in taking this matter into their own hands. Be it so. The propriety of this I shall not dispute. But here you relinquish the plan on which we set out, and in contemplation of which you was put in possession of the house. One principal branch of it was this academy taught by yourself, exactly on the footing it was conducted when you published your book. While you urge the churches then to support the education of preachers, you must certainly call on them to support

themselves. And you will never decry the plan of leaving the class to an individual, exhorting the churches to maintain a system of education for themselves, and at the same time teach them to continue to be obliged to that individual for the very houses in which they assemble, by the size of which, and their freedom from debt, they are enabled to make such exertions. While you discard his services in educating preachers, and take it upon yourselves, you will do it in reality not in appearance. You will never profess to give what is needful for this with one hand, while with the other you receive it from him. And when you break your former connection with him in all other respects, you will do it in regard to the house also.

While I state my reasons for expecting you to give up the house, both from the unscriptural nature of the transaction itself, and from the other considerations that now stand connected with it; I perfectly recollect that the idea of putting it into your possession originated wholly with myself, and was not solicited by you. At the same time you well know the principle on which I did this. It was designed to promote the kingdom of the Redeemer. But I am now convinced that besides being wrong in itself, it is operating powerfully in the contrary direction. I am convinced it is a bar to the spread of the gospel and its purity, calculated to introduce corruption into the other churches. For when they apply to you for assistance, you inquire into their sentiments and practices, and give or withhold according as these correspond with your own. This must of course be a great temptation thrown in the way of other churches. Here then I am placed in a most unpleasant situation. I see my talents ignorantly and sinfully committed to another, used daily to oppose, as I believe, the progress of truth. But as you now deem it high time

to change your course, and are publicly retracting what you call your errors ; so I feel myself at liberty to look for the restoration of this property. I received from you no equivalent for it, and the purpose for which I gave it is now defeated. I feel too the situation in which I am placed with you in regard to money accounts, and in other respects, exceedingly disagreeable. You certainly are at liberty to follow out your own views ; but opposed as they are to mine, it would be improper in you to do so with my means. Indeed I never can suppose that, all things considered, you would chuse to continue on the footing in which you now stand in that house, or that you would advise your church to do so. However legal your claim may be to retain possession of a house for which you gave nothing, and for which you are altogether obliged to me, you certainly will never urge it now. Independent too of other considerations, *all the advantages which you could reasonably desire from this transaction, you have already obtained.* It was an open door to you when you left your former situation in the church of Scotland. You have enjoyed possession of it for ten years. You are now well known and have extensive connections, and a numerous church which ought to provide for itself. And at any rate it is incumbent on you as well as on me to renounce what at the beginning was *unlawful* in itself, has been all along wrong, and also accompanied with many evils. Neither you nor I acted properly in the business. We must confess the "*rottenness of the whole scheme*," the expression emphatically used by yourself in reference to it.

I now request your attention to what follows. I cannot help thinking, that your late behaviour to me in Edinburgh and Glasgow is far removed from that which becometh the gospel. In Edinburgh you refu-

sed again and again to converse with me alone, as I desired, respecting your book and some other things. I told you I had no objection to meet you afterwards, if it should be necessary, in the presence of others, but that to meet *alone* in the first instance, was both the rule of scripture and the most conciliatory plan. As soon as I went to Glasgow, I called on you, and requested the same thing, which you again refused, and which obliged me in so abrupt a manner to tell you, that as you had now relinquished the plan of proceedings on which we had set out together, I expected you would give up the house you possessed from me. Had you given me an opportunity, either then or in Edinburgh, I would have fully and calmly detailed my reasons for such a demand. In the present circumstances of the churches, I would gladly have delayed saying any thing on this subject; but I thought this would be injustice to you, as matters then stood in Edinburgh. A few days afterwards, I wrote you my reasons for wishing to see you. Next day I heard you had gone to Edinburgh, and soon after learned that it was for the purpose of taking legal advice about your bond. When you returned, I expected you would have answered my letter; instead of which, when I met you on the street, you passed without speaking. The impropriety of such conduct can only affect yourself. It is plainly superseding the divine law, and is very contrary to the mind that was in Christ. If I had offended you, or if in any thing I appeared to you to be walking disorderly, it was your duty patiently to inquire into, and listen to the reasons I might give for my conduct. If I had none to give, or if they were not satisfactory, you should have warned me in the most faithful, but affectionate manner, before you was with reluctance com-

pelled to proceed any further. But this you neglected, you refused. The evil you have done therefore recoils upon yourself, and I can only warn and beseech you to take heed to your spirit. This is the more necessary, as the present is not the only indication of suc an error. I am informed, that at this moment, there are two reputed Christians, with whom you are not on speaking terms. One of them even belongs to a church with which you are in close union. Is this submission to Jesus Christ? Is it not in direct opposition to a fundamental law of his kingdom?

When I saw you last year in Glasgow, you complained that I had not adhered to that system of close co-operation with Mr Bogue, Mr Innes and you, on which we set out. Experience I believe has convinced us, that many things we then contemplated were both impracticable and improper. That the disposal of my talents should ever have been placed under the direction of others, was certainly very improper for me to concede in any degree, or for you to undertake or retain, as I now see clearly in regard to the Tabernacle. But in answer to what you then said, but which I did not recollect at that time, I must remind you, that although it was too much adhered to afterwards in your bond, you was the first who broke up that plan of co-operation. I had resolved to send a class to Mr Bogue to be educated, for the purpose of afterwards itinerating in Scotland, and had settled the matter with him. All the particulars you was informed of. When you went to Glasgow about purchasing the Circus, and to examine some of those who had applied for admission to that class, you remonstrated with me in the strongest manner, as I valued the success of all I was about to do, not to send the class to him, and offering to take it your-

self. By you alone I was influenced to alter my plan, and to write to Mr Bogue of the change, and I placed them under your care *. This was the strongest step I ever took in regard to any of you; and as it was not only approved but planned by you, it appears to have been your judgment, that the whole system of our co-operation, was always to be carried on in full subordination to the grand principle on which, and for which alone, I was devoting the application of my property, and that the latter ought always to be at my disposal. And what would you then have said, had you heard that Mr Bogue was gone to London to consult lawyers, whether he could compel me to adhere to the first design; and that he intended to avail himself of a right to enforce the continuance of a constrained co-operation?

I am, my dear Sir, &c.

* After listening to Mr Ewing's remonstrances, and maturely considering the business, it appeared to me to be my duty not to send the class to Mr Bogue. As the change, however, was not owing to Mr Bogue, I took an opportunity afterwards of getting a class instituted under him in England. I am sorry that I am obliged to mention his name in this business; but circumstances compel me. Part of the above will I believe be new to him. To the best of my recollection I never told him who was my adviser in this business.

To Mr Ewing.

MY DEAR SIR, *London, August* 12. 1808.

I HOPE you are seriously considering the subject of my last letter. The more you do so, the clearer, I am persuaded, will your duty appear. If a worldly transaction had taken place, by which I had transferred a possession to you, the matter would have been widely different. But that between us was purely of a religious nature. It put you to no expence, brought you under no legal obligations, and did not preclude you then, or afterwards, from any advantage; but, on the contrary, was a considerable accommodation. It was given professedly on Christian principles; in contemplation of a certain plan of proceedings, implying of course the tacit condition of following them out; and for the attainment of a particular object. From their very nature, the first of these are always subject to revision. For if any line of conduct has been adopted in consequence of a mistake regarding them, it ought to be retraced. It is evident that, in this case, I did mistake them; and besides the unlawfulness of the transference of my talents, and of the manner in which it was made, we violated the fundamental principle, that, *in a religious connection or co-operation, every thing ought to be free from first to last.* Legal bonds to fix the duration and terms of such co-operation, are radically opposed to the nature of the Christian dispensation. I hope this will not be disputed; and, if a truth, it renders the repentance of both of us an indispensable duty. In civil cases, if a flaw be discovered in the titles, or any thing illegal in the original agreement by which property is transferred, the deed is rendered in-

valid. The same principle must hold in a religious transaction, which ought to be abandoned as soon as it is found to be contrary to the law of God. It is also an undoubted fact that I put the Tabernacle into your hands, in the contemplation of a certain plan, which has been relinquished; and besides this, the whole of that religious connection on which we proceeded in regard to the business, has been broken up. This, on every principle of honour, of equity, and of religion, infers the duty of likewise giving up connection in the house. The particular object too to be attained, is now in my view defeated. This could not have been urged, had not your possession of the house been all along gratuitous; but that being the case, it cannot with any propriety be retained.

If you say, I ought to have considered all these things at the beginning, I admit it fully. But the want of this furnishes no plea for continuing to act on my inexperience at that time in religious matters. I was suddenly transported into a new scene. The fundamental principles on which from the first I proceeded, I recognize, and rejoice in more and more. But I was certainly ignorant of many things which I have since learned, especially the various shades and differences of opinion among Christians, by which they are prevented from coalescing or co-operating. The only lines I was then acquainted with, were those broad separating ones between the principal denominations, as they are called. Had I at that time known what I see now, it cannot for a moment be supposed, that I would have put the management of my talents into your hands. No: I had not then the smallest idea we could materially differ, unless one or both of us apostatized from the faith. For the truth of this I can appeal to you;

and I do not suppose that any Christian could satisfy himself in taking advantage of such a circumstance.

I would remind you of another most serious evil in this transaction. The house was vested in you for *the express and avowed purpose of giving you a power over the church*, which at that time appeared to be a desideratum in regard to pastors of Independent churches! How unscriptural and unlawful this principle was, I hope I have no occasion to urge. You wished me indeed to renounce *my right* to the property of the house; but you did not at the same time propose to give up *your right* during your incumbency, conveyed by the bond. When this was brought to your view, you declared the "rottenness of the whole scheme," which nothing I am sure since that time has tended to conceal or to cure. Some years afterwards, when an assistant was added, the choice of him, and his continuance in the office, were also vested in the most absolute manner in your hands, with the direct intention *of enabling you to retain the same power*. When some in your church proposed that Mr Wardlaw should be chosen your co-pastor, you pleaded as an objection the arrangement between you and me concerning the house, and the plan was quashed by you. Is it not my duty for ever to renounce such principles and practices as these? The more they are investigated, the less will they be found capable of bearing the light. How humbling a reflection is this! My only consolation regarding them is, that in what I did, I acted with integrity.

If for a moment it should be urged against the propriety of your giving up the house, that the church was gathered on the idea of its being free to them, it could only be said that it was so during *your pleasure* or *incumbency*. With how much more advantage however could they at present procure accommodation for them-

selves elsewhere, than in the event of any disagreement on account of which they might be excluded by you? Or, if such a circumstance should never occur, when at any rate they must give it up at your removal by death or otherwise? When this should happen, their situation would, according to their present system, be exceedingly unpleasant and unsafe, as they would at the same time be deprived of their pastor and of their house. But, independent of these considerations, it is now time for you to point out, and for them to consider, the duty of providing for themselves, and of ceasing to receive accommodation at the expence of another, who does not belong to their assembly. This duty is explicitly taught by the Scriptures; see 1 Tim. v. 8. 16. It is more blessed to give than to receive; and Christians ought to provide for themselves, and their own, even if others should be willing to do it for them. While this is overlooked and neglected, in what light are we to view collections made to build houses for other churches, or to forward any religious object? The whole becomes doubly important, when, through difference of sentiment, the assistance they receive is not voluntary, but constrained—when lawyers are resorted to, to give it effect. If, in such a way, a church could obtain or perpetuate an advantage through any one's mistake, even were nothing unlawful in the case, should they desire it? In the character of their profession, they ought rather to be thankful for the accommodation they had enjoyed, cheerfully provide in future for themselves, and act on the principle of doing to others as they would be done by.

In full corroboration of what I have advanced, that, notwithstanding the bond, it is my duty to renounce what I conceive to be unlawful, and to require you to do so, allow me to quote some reasonings from your

paper on vows in the Missionary Magazine for January 1804.

'A vow was *a promise or solemn engagement*, under 'the form of an oath.'—'Of all the abuses of unchri- 'stian vows, one of the wildest is, that of insisting on 'their fulfilment independently of their merits, when at 'any time they happen to have been made. Those who 'have simply or rashly been led to make them, are told, 'that after vows they must not make inquiry; that 'though it be but a man's covenant, yet, if it be confirm- 'ed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. If the in- 'quirer venture to express a doubt or a scruple, instead 'of being instructed as to the point in question, he is re- 'minded of the standard which he engaged to abide by, 'which perhaps he subscribed. And a change of senti- 'ment, however conscientious, is branded as perjury, in 'virtue of vows for ever to adhere to former principles, 'which at the time appeared to be agreeable to truth. Nay, 'to such extravagance of Jesuitism do some proceed, as 'pretty plainly to assert, that whatever the man who has 'vowed may afterwards think, and have reason to think, 'he must continue to speak and to act, and if a minister 'to preach and to dispense ordinances, according to the 'vow by which he is bound; as if professional consis- 'tency must be maintained in opposition to integrity of 'heart.

'Now every thing to which we stand engaged by a 'vow, must in itself be either right or wrong. If right, 'it has a claim upon us independently of our unwarrant- 'able vow: if wrong, shall it be sanctified and made 'binding by that which is itself unwarrantable? Even 'when vows were permitted, those only were established 'which the law of God would recognize, and surely it 'never recognized an engagement to do what is wrong. 'Solomon does indeed say, Prov. xx. 25. "It is a snare to

'the man who devoureth that which is holy, and after 'vows to make inquiry." But the thing devoured is 'evidently there supposed to be a holy thing, and the 'vows after which the man is cautioned not to make 'inquiry, are evidently such vows as the law held sacred. 'To make inquiry here, is to seek an evasion of a duty, 'and cannot apply to a refusal to continue in a sin. 'The apostle's remark Gal. iii. 15. respecting a man's 'covenant, is perfectly just; but still it supposes that 'covenant to be legal. What will become of a man's 'covenant, if, upon examination, it be found contrary to 'the law of the land? The greatest novice in law can 'answer the question. However solemnly confirmed, 'however well meant, however highly applauded, how-'ever long revered, the discovery is fatal to its existence. 'What is illegal is null and void. The party supposed 'to be bound, is held bound no longer; and it will be 'well for the party who bound him, if he be not found 'liable to an action for damages. In like manner, if a 'vow be contrary to the word of God, it cannot bind us. 'When the error is detected, our liberty is proclaimed, 'and we are bound to assert it. Men who would seek 'to retain us in fetters of this kind, are not aware of the 'responsibility which they incur. They are often loud 'in their denunciations against those who have escaped 'from their tyranny, yet the guilt and the danger are all 'their own. "As the bird by wandering, as the swallow 'by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come," Prov. 'xxvi. 2.

'A vow to do what is wrong, demands repentance, 'not fulfilment. If the resolution be sinful, how much 'more the performance. If a vow could bind us in op-'position to the revealed will of God, Satan might easily 'contrive to secure inviolably all the remaining subjects 'of his kingdom. It would only be necessary to induce

'them to swear allegiance, and then to plead conscience 'for rejecting the gospel. The Israelites once tried an 'apology of this kind for persisting in idolatry. We 'may judge of its validity from the answer which they 'received. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of 'Israel saying, Ye and your wives have both spoken 'with your mouths, and fulfilled with your hand, saying, '*We will surely perform our vows that we have vowed*, 'to burn incense to the queen of heaven, and to pour 'out drink offerings unto her. *Ye will surely accomplish* '*your vows, and surely perform your vows.* Therefore 'hear ye the word of the Lord, all Judah that dwell in 'the land of Egypt, behold *I have sworn by my great* '*name*, saith the Lord, that my name shall no more be 'named in the mouth of any man of Judah, in all the 'land of Egypt, saying, the Lord God liveth. Behold 'I will watch over them for evil, and not for good; and 'all the men of Judah that are in the land of Egypt, shall 'be consumed by the sword and by the famine, until 'there be an end of them. Yet a small number that 'escape the sword, shall return out of the land of Egypt 'into the land of Judah, and all the remnant of Judah 'that are gone into the land of Egypt to sojourn there, 'shall know *whose word shall stand, mine or theirs*," 'Jer. xliv. 25,—28.

'The truth is, the gospel finds men very generally fet- 'tered by vows. The heathens have ever been in the 'habit of vowing to their idols. Yet no Christian will 'say that a vow may be pleaded as an apology for de- 'clining to obey the gospel. If then a vow made in un- 'belief cannot be sustained as a bar to conversion, it will 'be difficult to prove that a vow made in ignorance and 'simplicity by a babe in Christ, at his very entrance in- 'to Christian communion, and in order to his admission 'into it; a vow recommended and insisted on by those

'to whom he looked up as fathers, should be sustained 'as a bar to his subsequent progress in knowledge, espe- 'cially, when he has discovered that the vow itself was 'an unscriptural imposition. Similar reasoning will ap- 'ply to such an imposition in every period of the Chris- 'tian life, and in every case in which it is practised.

'The obligation of vows, indeed, as furnishing mat- 'ter of reproach against those who have renounced them, 'is a topic of declamation rather than of reasoning; and 'those who dwell upon it, display the spirit of party ra- 'ther than unfeigned love of the truth.'

I beg you will now review the whole that has been said in this and my former letter. I have multiplied reasons, not with a view to attach blame for what is past, but in order to influence your conduct for the future. I have shewn that the deed was *unlawful* in itself—in the manner of it—the patronage it includes, and the design of retaining an illegitimate power over the church; and likewise in the way in which it is "*provided and agreed*" that your salary was to be collected, not directly and voluntarily from the church, but from the united contributions of the church and the world; and by seat-rents, which is both a compulsatory and unequal mode. The smallest consideration will convince any one how far the rule of Scripture is thus departed from. The manner there enjoined for attending to a divine institution is *changed and fixed by a stamped bond!* To the mode thus devised and substituted, your aphorisms in the Missionary Magazine, Vol. 9th, are but too applicable. 'A Christian church,' you say, 'in al- 'liance with worldly institutions, and prostituting the 'privileges of Christians to worldly men, for the sake of 'temporal advantages, is the spiritual abomination of 'which the Jewish church, when they made a covenant 'with idolaters, was only a figure.' And again you ob-

serve, 'Without being separated from sinners, Chris-'tians cannot convert them. If churches approach so 'near the world as to form an alliance with it, the men 'of it will naturally suppose that they are sufficiently 'connected with Christianity.' Is not a church *prostituting its privileges for the sake of temporal advantages*, when it calls in and accepts the aid of the world to maintain its pastor? When he is supported by them jointly, is there no *connection?* Is not this *forming an alliance* in an ordinance of Christ? Is it not *prostituting its privileges for the sake of temporal advantages*, when a church retains possession of a house by a bond, which fixes upon them the unscriptural office of an assistant; which deprives them of the choice of any of their teachers; which contradicts the Scriptures in the manner of providing for their pastor's support; and prohibits them, although duty should seem to demand the disappointment, from obtaining another whom they desire? I believe your aphorisms and your paper on vows were both written with a view to the established church; but the more the nature of the bond is considered, the more it will appear, that many things which may be said against the one as a worldly kingdom, will equally conclude against the other. It is well to call upon others to come out of Babylon, but it is our first duty to extricate ourselves.

In addition to all the above considerations I have noticed that the original system has been relinquished, and that all connection except in the house has been broken, which also *you proposed long before it happened, if others would have agreed to it.* On the other hand, that you and the church have already gained all the advantages from the transaction with me that could reasonably be desired. And finally, that in the case of Mr Bogue, you have yourself in the most positive manner

decided the matter in question by your conduct and judgment on the occasion, clearly expressed and fully acted on for several years, without the smallest indication of change of mind. For every thing was then equally settled with him in respect to the class as with you in regard to the house, *excepting the formality of being extended in a bond*; a circumstance on account of which it is impossible that you could maintain there was any radical difference.

I am, my dear Sir, &c.

P. S.—I am sorry I spoke to you about giving up the house before I had an opportunity of explaining my reasons. We should certainly be on our guard against casting stumbling-blocks in each other's way. I am afraid this was a temptation to you to act as you did in going so hastily to Edinburgh to consult a laywer.

I WISHED as little as possible to offend Mr Ewing; but I see the apology in the preceding postscript was unnecessary. When I requested Mr Ewing to converse with me about the business of the Tabernacle, I did not anticipate that he would refuse to do so.

To Mr Ewing.

MY DEAR SIR, *London, Aug.* 27. 1808.

I HAVE received a letter from Mr Harley, to which I shall afterwards reply. In the meantime, as it is with you I have to do, I think it proper to inform you, that it contains a proposal to which I can by no means accede. He wishes me to name a price at which I would sell the Tabernacle to the church, in settling which he says, *I will no doubt deduct the value of the lease.* I have stated the grounds on which I consider that I have a right to expect from you the restoration of the house, and no bargaining between us in regard to it can possibly take place until it be fully restored. After that will be the time for considering what further should be done. Mr Harley is mistaken, if he thinks that pecuniary reimbursement is in any shape my object. I am surprised, however, that a thought should have been entertained, which led to the proposal of a deduction on account of what he very improperly terms a lease *. I might rather have expected, that a sense of what had so long been gratuitously enjoyed, would have induced the offer of different terms; and that one in Mr Harley's situation, from whom some things in

* It has been remarked that the tenure by which Mr Ewing holds the Tabernacle, is really a tack or lease, and not a bond. I never intended to lay any stress on the legal distinction between the two. I only wished to guard against the idea of its being a tenure, possessed on account of some payment made on the other side; when this is kept in view, it matters not by what name the deed is called. It is a gratuitous obligation; and however denominated, a most carnal instrument to form the basis, and to ensure the continuance of Christian co-operation!

his letter come with a very ill grace, would have spurned at the idea of claiming or extorting the continuance of possession of the house, as things now stand. It is a poor matter for men capable of *providing for themselves*, to talk as he does. Independently of what has happened, I wonder that he has not seen and felt this.

The longer I consider it, the more fully I am persuaded that what I have stated to you is right. The bond is wrong in itself; its implied condition is departed from, and my intention in giving it frustrated. The last, I should suppose, without any thing else, considering the manner in which you received it, will be sufficient to decide your mind. It was a matter of confidence; and when confidence on the subject of it is at an end, it should cease. No man or church, I should think, would choose to hold their place of meeting, on such terms as it would henceforth be possessed on, in virtue of the bond. Mr Harley intimates, that there is but one opinion on the subject, as to the propriety of your holding it. In this he is mistaken. It would not however be surprising if it were so, till the case is understood, which it cannot yet be. To this hour, there is no person but my wife who knows what I have written to you on the subject. I mentioned before, that it was not my object to blame you for the past. Indeed, in many respects, things stand at present on a different footing from what they formerly did. I would now say further, that it was never my intention to put you and the church to any unreasonable inconvenience. I should willingly allow a certain time, on terms that might be arranged, for you to provide yourselves in a house, if you should wish to build a new one, which I should suppose would be most eligible. Indeed, my dear Sir, I am not acting from any irritation against you. I can-

not approve of your conduct, but I wish you well both in the present and future world. What I have written has been dictated by a sense of duty.

I shall take this opportunity of adverting a little to your book on church-government, of which I wished to have conversed with you. I am sorry to be obliged to observe, that besides the exceptionable things it contains, it is written in a manner of which you have need deeply to repent. If much impressed with the importance of your subject, you had been every where very earnest, and had even expressed yourself strongly, yet without either levity or asperity, you could not have been blamed. But I am sorry to say that it is otherwise. You ought surely to have avoided what you had formerly *exposed* in the case of Mr Brown. You say it was "written in haste, and with great reluctance*." This forms no excuse for sending such a production into the world. It required the utmost deliberation. The sentence† after the one above quoted, I confess I do not know how to reconcile with the fact, that Mr Aikman had written on the subject, and sent his paper to you, and that you, to say the least, did not encourage him to enlarge or to publish. But I notice two or three things in which I am more immediately implicated.

In page 56, you assign a reason for the short period allotted for the education of the preachers. Here I am concerned to say you have not adhered to fact. *We were not tempted to fix on a short period of preparation, when many churches were forming*, or in any way to yield to the pressure of temporary circumstances.

* Mr Ewing's book, p. 208. at top.

† 'If there had been any probability of a publication to the 'same purpose from another quarter, we should have most gladly 'declined the task.'

There was not one church formed when the length of the course was fixed. Instead of that paragraph, which I am sorry that you could have written, why did you not rather state, in the clearest manner, *your decided change* on this subject, especially when you was so warmly engaged in fixing changes upon me? Why have you hinted, page 57, that you from the beginning (as it will be understood) acted in hope that our plan would be extended, viz. in point of time of preparation, as I understand you, and as in connection with what goes before, it must be understood? On the contrary, you should have fully declared, that then there was no such design; that all our plans were laid on an opposite principle; that on this principle, and in the confidence that you would adhere to it, the class and the Tabernacle were put into your hands, which neither would nor could have been the case, had you then "*perceived*," which you say "unhappily" you "did not," what you have written in the three first sentences of the paragraph, page 57. But do you not recollect, that fifteen months was the period of education first fixed upon, and that in the view of no more being given, you so readily undertook the charge of the students? Do you remember, that in conversing with them for admission, you told them that fifteen months was the period assigned; that *it was enough for them; and if that was not sufficient, they were unfit for the work?* And I recollect well, that when I proposed to increase the time to two years, you observed, that in that time they would be very well instructed indeed.

The manner then of bringing forward these preachers, with the principles it involved, and the consequences it has led to, the last not then fully comprehended by us, but discerned by others, (see your book, page 164.*) was the

* This refers to what is said of Mr Robertson's prediction.

radical basis of your co-operation and mine. You acceded fully to it; and it was in confidence that we were united in the fundamental views on which my efforts to this hour have proceeded, that I put you in possession of the house. If you now "*retract your errors*," and "*change your course*," while I continue to follow out the original principle in its legitimate progress, does not this demand that you should return what I then gave? Would not the opposite conduct be abusing confidence, and taking advantage of ignorance? Never will I ascribe this to you, unless I am constrained by what I do not expect *.

Having mentioned the class, I will here advert to what I have confessed to you before, and what I still feel to have been wrong. Some time after you began to teach it, you engaged in reading Glas's works, to which you became very partial. At that time I had not read them; and hearing the general cry of prejudice against what is called *Sandemanianism*, and learning at the same time that many in the class had imbibed Glas's sentiments, I thought you was not doing them justice, and even said so to others. This I confess was wrong. I should have studied the subject immediately for myself, especially after having heard your disputes with Mr Bogue about faith; and, instead of hinting the matter in the way of warning you against Glas, I should have spoken to you fully. In neglecting this, I did very wrong; and the recollection of it is one of those things that have contributed to impress me, in a very strong manner, with the necessity of the fullest

* Independent of any other change in Mr Ewing or me, either real or supposed, the moment he denounced the class, which was then conducted exactly as when at first instituted, in connection with the Tabernacle, which he himself had notified to the public, that moment it was his duty to give up the house.

and most confidential explanations among Christians when any misunderstanding subsists. On the other hand, you will do me the justice to recollect, that after I became convinced that you had been right in the view of doctrine which you gave the class, and I had been wrong, I wrote to you, confessing that I had done you great injustice, (although I believe I did not mention the reasons of my former opinion), and requesting that you would not answer that part of my letter. I was then fully satisfied on the subject; and as we had opportunities of meeting, it was unnecessary to write more upon it, and we afterwards conversed together about it in Edinburgh.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

It appears that I am again alluded to by you as not acknowledging the church to which I belonged in every thing I did, that had respect to the general interests of the gospel. I was surprised when I saw this brought forward, because I had before explained the matter to yourself. I informed you that I fully recognized the principle, and was reluctantly prevented from acting upon it by the existing circumstances of the church. I hoped that these would be altered for the better, and so render that practicable, which was not so at present. I well knew, that had I proposed a mission to Newcastle or London, it could not have been unanimously agreed to, although I was convinced it ought to be undertaken exactly on the same principle on which all the churches had united in sending a missionary to New York. But the principle itself, that brethren in fellowship ought to maintain the strictest union, cordially co-operating, and mutually consulting, in what they do for the interests of the gospel, I fully admit, and desire, as circumstances will allow, constantly to act upon; and where it is not acted on, I agree that there is much evil, which ought

to be rectified without delay*. As far however as I understand the paragraph in your book to which I refer, your own practice appears to be at variance with it. You wish to find the churches consulted "in fitting men for the work of the ministry." But was this ever done, or did you ever propose it during all the time that the classes were under your care? The church joined in prayer indeed when they were sent out; but neither at that time as to where the preachers should go, nor during their studies, was it in any respect consulted. You observe that a man may manage his private affairs, while you would make a difference as to what concerns the general interests of the gospel, and then you proceed to illustrate your meaning. I would ask, if in publishing the very book containing these sentiments, involving so deeply and immediately the general interests of the gospel, and of all the churches, you have not acted contrary to your own professed principle, when you neither acknowledged nor consulted any one.

In going to Edinburgh in the manner you did to preach in Bernard's rooms, the most complete contradiction appears to the principles you have laid down. I proceed on the supposition of what I believe to be truth, (if I am wrong, I wish to be put right), that your church was not "acknowledged," "consulted," or "asked to bid you God speed." A case in which this was more necessary can never occur. A church had divided, of which you had originally been a member, and active in its formation; with which the church you belonged to had been from the first in union, and

* There are many things however, I apprehend, even relating to the interests of the gospel, which, as individuals, we may and ought to do according to circumstances. The churches, no doubt, should in all things watch over the conduct of their members, and take cognizance of it when contrary to the law of Christ.

had actively co-operated in sending out missions for the spread of the gospel, and which they were at that very time jointly supporting; and to one of whose number they were indebted for the house in which they assembled. On this occasion, what conduct ought to have been pursued? Should not your church have sent messengers to the spot, calmly to investigate the matter, and affectionately to remonstrate if error was discovered, giving their best advice, joined with their fervent prayers, and waiting for a season to observe the effect? But nothing of this kind was done. On the contrary, you joined yourself to one of the parties, without ever attempting a meeting with the other. Independently of what you have written, was not this walking disorderly? Was it not an open violation of all the rules of fellowship, while, with regard to your church, you disjoined them without their consent, asked or given, from those with whom they had been walking in union? Are you not also in use of assisting in the ordination of pastors of other churches, with some of whom you have little or no acquaintance, without "consulting" or "asking the prayers of the church?"

Throughout your book, it is your great desire to stamp the character of fickleness on those whom you oppose; and you ascribe many of the opinions they now hold to a love of change. Here is the very charge which the world so loudly vociferated against us all, when you left the church of Scotland. I must say, it is at least as groundless now, as it was then, and from you it comes with a much worse grace. When the *change* was made in Edinburgh respecting the Lord's supper, you expressed the strongest approbation of my brother's address to the church. In the first page of that letter, he reminds them, that 'our practice subjects us to what some will deem an inconvenience. It

'obliges us avowedly to follow the word of God where-
'ever it may lead us, and doubtless this may expose us
'to the charge of fickleness, inconsistency, and not
'knowing to-day what views we may adopt to-morrow.'
I confess, I did not expect at that time to be subjected to this inconvenience from you, while I should continue to be conscious, as I am at present, of only seeking to follow the word of God, and to know more of his will. My changes since then, as far as I know, have arisen from this quarter; while hitherto they appear to have been all in one direction, the gradual developement of one and the same principle.

I began with practising the Lord's supper monthly. Afterwards I became convinced, that on the principles I held, I ought to observe it weekly. Here was a change, but did it indicate changeableness? I began with a "few individuals," yourself being one of them, who "erected themselves into a church;" and I am now convinced, that any set or number of Christians, where there is no church of Christ, may act as we did. I began with observing the Lord's supper, while you occasionally presided at that service, before you was appointed an elder of any church. Or if you once had obtained *ordination* in what you then called Babylon, and from the hands of such as you spake of as unconverted, and unfit to belong to any church, or to observe any ordinance, you had afterwards fully renounced it, by becoming an individual member in what you deemed a church of Christ, and had completely divested yourself of the office of bishop, by choosing a pastor over you. I now believe that other churches mey observe it as we did, and as they observe other ordinances before they have obtained elders, which however they ought to do as soon as possible. I began with deeming it unlawful to exclude those who wished

to witness them, from any of the ordinances the church observed, excepting discipline. I am now convinced, that in this exception I was wrong, for on examining the matter, I find nothing to warrant it in the Scriptures. I began with being persuaded, that churches should not hold fellowship with the world, except in the contribution of their money. I now blush when I think of such an exception. I began with considering exhortation of the brethren on a week day a church ordinance, which I believe you was the *first* among us to inculcate; and I am now convinced, that by the same rule of interpretation, it cannot be excluded from the Lord's day. These are among the principal changes that I at present recollect, and I conceive their character is such as not justly to subject me to the charge of changeableness. I have been endeavouring 'to distinguish the institu-'tions of God from the institutions, and customs, and 'projects of men. Changes occasioned by a disavowal 'of the latter, when contrary to the former, will always 'be useful*.'

In defending myself against the charge of a spirit of fickleness and innovation, it would be of small consequence were I able to fix it upon you. Yet I believe this might be attempted with some appearance of success. You was for several years a minister of the church of Scotland, and afterwards came out of it, declaring it was Babylon. You engaged in a mission to India, and before it was prevented from another quarter, you abandoned the design. You came to me with Mr Grove, on a deputation from ministers of the established church, to persuade me not to build a Tabernacle in Edinburgh; and a little after, you was a chief promoter of the plan. You drew out a set of rules for the church, and now you "derive unspeakable

* Ewing on Church-government.

benefit from the rejection of human standards." You long taught the churches to depend for preachers, on "a source of supply which is private;" but now you consider it "high time to change your course." In regard to the true nature of preparatory studies, you are now anxious to "retract your own errors." You was warm in your disapprobation of clerical dignity, and used in this respect to speak of the ministers of the church of Scotland, with whom you formerly associated, in terms both of ridicule and censure; but now you seem to think it impossible to hold the bishop too high, or to make the exclusive rights of his office too extensive. You was an avowed enemy to ecclesiastical titles, and publicly preached against them; but now you defend and accept them under another form. Before you left Lady Glenorchy's chapel, you was so forcibly struck with the evidence for exhortation by the brethren, in lecturing on Heb. x. 25. that finding it impossible to call on your hearers to attend to the duty, it was the first thing which convinced you, that you was not in a church of Christ; but what is now the fate of this passage? When you commenced at the Circus, you was the principal advocate for exhortation in the church; and when you went to Glasgow, you gave it out, that in this as *in other respects, it was your object to restore the brethren to their proper situation in the churches, from which they had been displaced:* of late you have discovered, that except in *a fellowship meeting* they have no right to speak, and that in the church it would be intolerable, as it would silence the bishop. Is it any wonder then, that those whom you left behind you in the church of Scotland, declare (I use their own words) that "you are now returning to your senses," and that some of your oldest and best friends, who are still in that church, lament that you now go too far in

the opposite direction from what you took when you separated from them? Is it right in you, after all this, to adopt against those whom you oppose, almost the very language of the Pastoral Admonition, and the words with which you was pursued out of the church of Scotland, and which you then so indignantly repelled? Are we yet to be branded by you with the character of changeableness? I am persuaded the charge rests with yourself. It would have indicated no fickleness, had you continued your progress when you left the church of Scotland, for you had not then attained, nor were perfect; but you have receded from what you then held.

A man may sometimes make a change in the principle on which he acts, while his practice remains the same; and on the other hand, may be obliged to vary his practice, while he is steadily following out his original principle. The former appears to be your case, the latter to be ours. Observe what has actually taken place. You have departed from your original principle in regard to exhortation; but upon another principle, you have continued the appearance of your former practice. We have adhered to our original principle, and followed it out, but have varied our practice, by introducing exhortation on the Lord's day. This remark will be found generally to apply to what has happened among us, and whoever reads with attention your former publications, and compares them with your last, will easily perceive that the tone of your mind has undergone a very considerable alteration. But after all, the question regarding duty does not lie here. I am only opposing the cry you have so improperly raised. Why did you not more thoroughly weigh the subjects of difference, and earnestly, yet affectionately warn those you thought misled? Instead of this,

having " written in haste," you have pursued throughout your book a very different course, and have adopted a manner of reproof calculated to harden and disunite, not to reform and reclaim. Your ridicule on such a subject is entirely misplaced, and I believe universally condemned. How different is the style of reproof to the seven churches from Him whose eyes are as a flame of fire !

Your quotation, p. 164. from Mr Robertson, you consider as a prophecy, but there is nothing prophetical in it. The opinion he states, which you have marked in italics, is the fair and just conclusion of one, who it seems discerned clearer than you did, the ultimate tendency of those measures which you was then pursuing and warmly defending, although you have since abandoned them.

Where had you observed when you wrote your book, a departure from the zeal at first discovered to diffuse the knowledge of the gospel? The rule of Scripture was indeed more consulted, and usefulness was aimed at only in the path of duty. But this does not entitle you to use the language you have done.

You find fault with the public teaching, as turning on subjects of internal arrangement; but in regard to things of this nature, who has exceeded you? Do you recollect the manner in which you preached on church order, for a long time after you went to Glasgow? You have not forgotten the fast days, in which you said so much against the church of Scotland, or the frequent sermons you preached in Edinburgh on that subject. I can declare for myself, that I am persuaded, it would not far, if at all exceed the truth, were I to say, that I have heard more from you in public on these subjects, than from all our other preachers, or any other man I ever heard. While our attention was directed to the

corruptions of the church of Scotland, you was a leader in the cry. Whenever reform was attempted among ourselves, you adopt almost the very words of our opponents, and your motions are retrograde. In regard to your concluding paragraph, you only re-echo the language which Roman Catholics used at the Reformation. The reformers soon became divided, and the progress of light was checked; but was the fault with those who went forward, or with those who stood still?

I conclude with mentioning, that I have heard you are finding fault with my conduct towards the churches in regard to their money-concerns. I hope you are fully aware of the evil of misrepresentation, and that you will be on your guard in this respect. I cannot urge this further at present, because I do not know what you may have said. As to the matter itself, you may have the fullest opportunity of information from your friend Mr Dymock, who has managed all these concerns for some years past. You will find from him, that nothing has been done on this subject which is worthy of blame, or which it is necessary to conceal.

It is truly grievous to be constrained to write to you in such a way: to you, for whom I have had much affection, with whom I have held sweet fellowship, and have co-operated in a work, the effects of which in its progress, will, I have no doubt, be productive of joy in the eternal world. Sincerely should I rejoice, if ever we were again to meet in the service of our Lord, in the acknowledgment of common principles, and an enlightened understanding of his will. Oh! that God may discover where sin has been committed, where error has been embraced, that repentance may be given to the acknowledgment of what is wrong—that both of us may yet be honoured to serve him here, and finally to enjoy him for evermore.

I am, my dear Sir, &c.

HAVING learned that Mr Ewing had come to Edinburgh, I sent to him the following note.

MY DEAR SIR, *Edinburgh, Oct.* 10. 1808.

I conceive that I now stand in the situation towards you, which is described and provided for, Matt. xviii. 15. I therefore intend, if the Lord will, to call upon you at your lodgings, to-morrow evening, at half past eight o'clock, that I may speak with you alone. I name so late an hour, supposing you may be engaged through the day. If that hour be inconvenient, I shall be glad to hear from you, and will be ready to meet you at any other hour or place which you may appoint.

I am, my dear Sir, &c.

At the hour appointed I called, but Mr Ewing was not at home; nor had any message been left for me. I therefore wrote to him the following letter after his return to Glasgow.

To Mr Ewing.

MY DEAR SIR, *Edinburgh, Nov.* 7. 1808.

ACCORDING to the note which I left at your house, when you was last in Edinburgh, I called at the time appointed; but not finding you at home, I conclude that it is not your intention to meet me alone. I had once resolved to proceed immediately to the second step, Matt. xviii. 16.; but after more maturely considering

the matter, and taking the advice of Christian brethren, I perceive it is my duty to proceed no further. The line of conduct, which in cases of offence we are commanded to pursue, is distinctly pointed out; and the law which requires the one to go to the other, equally binds on that other the duty of receiving him. His not hearing him, or being convinced by him, is a matter entirely distinct, and it is for this that provision is made in the steps which follow. If this process be stopped by one of the parties in any of its stages, the other is not at liberty to advance further. On such an occasion, did both belong to one church, it would be the duty of that church to admonish the former to yield to every part of the course prescribed, and nothing respecting the case itself could come before them till that was done. If he persisted, they must exclude him from their fellowship.

I refer you still to my letter of June 13. I have the same feeling towards you as a man, and the same object in view, which I there stated.

I understand you assign it as a season for not meeting me alone, that our former conversations of this kind have been misrepresented, and always fruitless. I do not know of such misrepresentations. If you have heard of any, it would have been well to have traced them to their source and proceeded accordingly. Nor is it a proper statement to say that our former conversations have been fruitless. If this had even been so, on what principle could we be justified for not proceeding to the remaining steps enjoined in case of offences? But I remember only one occasion when we held some conversations alone, such as what I have now desired. The result you recollect was good, and you said at parting that you did not expect it would have ended so well.

Surely, however, we had reason to look for this, if we met in the disposition we ought to possess one to another, and in obedience to the will of Jesus. But if you thought that many of the desultory conversations which we have had were fruitless, has this been experienced without a cause? The first unhappy introduction of jealousy betwixt us, was the unscriptural transaction of the bond, so foreign in its whole conception to the nature of the kingdom of Christ; and which, as far as we were concerned in it, removed us entirely off scriptural ground. Besides, have you always upon these occasions dealt with that wisdom which cometh from above; or have you not often spoken in such a way as tended to fortify the mind against any reasoning you might adduce? Have I not done the same to you? I cannot doubt it: yet I really think that you have exceeded, and been deficient in that meekness with which God is well pleased. But even admitting all you allege as a reason for not meeting now, is it sufficient, and will it bear you out on another day? The rule is still the same, and it will be well for us to be found in the path of duty and submission, be the consequences what they may. Our obedience must be unreserved. We are called to persevere in acts of kindness and forbearance one towards another, and to the very last to overcome evil with good. We must never suppose that the case is hopeless, in regard to the probability of affecting the conscience of any one, who, professing submission to the laws of Jesus Christ, is willing to meet and to hear what we shall say. We may have failed many a time in bringing him to what we conceive he ought to see, yet by perseverance in Christian means, it may at last, by the blessing of God, be accomplished. "Brethren," says an apostle, "if

any of you do err from the truth and one convert him, let him know that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." But, alas! how differently are we disposed to treat one another from the manner in which the Lord treats us all. After he has had compassion on us and forgiven us our debt, how ready are we to take our fellow-servant by the throat, and to say pay me that thou owest. Here more or less we are all guilty, but when any thing resembling this spirit, or leading to its indulgence, is deliberately approved and persisted in, what will be the consequence?

I intreat you to consider what you are doing. You are resisting the authority of an explicit commandment of Jesus Christ, Matth. xviii. 15. I cannot in consistency with the rule of Scripture act differently towards you from the way which I have proposed, and shall, I trust, be at all times ready to follow. I apprehend that you have trespassed against me in more respects than one, and I wish to speak to you alone. This is the first step, and I must not overleap, or supersede it, to proceed to the second. I lament your conduct, and I hope you will not persevere in it. As to myself, I rest in the consciousness of having done in this matter what duty requires, while it is painful to be placed in a situation with you, in which I never before stood with any other man. Henceforth the whole remains with you. On a former occasion, you long stood out in the case of an offence between you and one of your friends. I believe I was then the happy means of at length producing a conviction in your mind that you was wrong. It is my desire and prayer that God may now give you repentance to the acknowledging of the truth. I intend to write to you, in a day or two, respecting the

Tabernacle, which is a business distinct from the above, and on which I shall be under the necessity of holding communications with you as long as we remain on the present footing in regard to that house.

I am, my dear Sir, &c.

To Mr Ewing.

MY DEAR SIR, *Edinburgh, Nov.* 15. 1808.

I WROTE to Mr Harley, Sept. 22. in answer to what he said about purchasing the Tabernacle. * * * *

I have lately been informed, that the church and you intend to provide yourselves in another house, in which case, nothing more need be said on the subject. I hope this report is well founded. The intention, if it exist, is certainly a proper one. The means of procuring accommodation for yourself, are now within your own reach.

I understand you have written answers to my letters to Mr Harley and you. I should be glad to see them. If I am mistaken in any thing, or have done you injustice in my statements, I wish to be convinced of it. If you send me your manuscript, it shall be safely returned. I desire in the whole of this matter to do and to say only what is right. I have stated the grounds on which it appeared to me to be my duty explicitly to profess my repentance of a sin I have ignorantly committed, and to point out to you the evil of the transaction, in which you are likewise implicated. I have reminded you of the inconsistency of your continuing to retain the house, after having broken off religious connection in all other respects. This, especially consider-

ing the manner in which it was done, (when you came to Edinburgh in the beginning of last summer), infers the equitable obligation, of also renouncing a possession conveyed and obtained on the ground of that connection, as forming a part of it, and in the unquestioned expectation of its continuance. I have also brought to view your avowed change of principle in regard to the preparation of preachers, both in mode and kind, which is conclusive on the subject, and will be decisive to any man's feelings of propriety, in a matter so purely gratuitous and confidential. It constituted a fundamental part of my plan; and in virtue of your agreement in it, you obtained possession of the bond. In the preface to the fourth volume of the Missionary Magazine, you announced the connection betwixt the class and the Tabernacle.

In every part of the business, I proceeded, as you know, in the full persuasion that your principles and mine were the same, and that the interests of the gospel would be always, in my view, promoted by your occupying the Tabernacle. Such being the case, and as you are well acquainted with what my sentiments were at that time, am I not warranted to appeal to yourself, and to ask whether, after having possessed the house so long, and every thing having turned out so differently from what was supposed, it would not be right and agreeable to yourself to restore what you received in the exercise of such unbounded confidence? I beg you to weigh this well, and to give due consideration to all the various circumstances which now exist between you and me. Pleasure in continuing to hold your present situation, I am sure you cannot have. This forced connection would constantly give rise to unexpected and disagreeable interferences and opposition. I have already adverted to some things which the bond

puts in my power, and there are others I have hitherto allowed, in passing your accounts, which were on my part voluntary. I understand you say, that I desired you* to make the monthly collections, which I formerly noticed. I do not doubt that this was the case. But you must observe, I am not finding fault with the past, I am only referring to the future. I may here also mention, that in connection with this, I was informed that you say your undertaking the charge of the class, was in consequence of my offering it to you. I believe it was. You urged me not to entrust it to Mr Bogue. I then asked if you would take it, to which you immediately assented.

The bond itself, as far as it goes, is liable to the same objections with the Confession of Faith, the faults of which you have long since discovered. While your signature at it remains, you bind yourself under a penalty to conform to the conditions therein prescribed. You have declared, that the doctrines which you formerly preached, were "modified by feelings of previous stipulation†," and here, in certain respects, you are again placed on the same ground. You say, that since withdrawing your subscription from a human confession, you have studied the Scriptures with a degree of liberty and comfort which you never knew before, and that your present situation has constantly led you to the Bi-

* I am informed that Mr Ewing has in his possession a letter from me to this effect. I do not remember it; but I have no doubt of the fact. I wrote many letters to Mr Ewing. But although he and I occasionally differed on some points, yet I always wrote to him in confidence, and as to a friend; and therefore, excepting the above letters, I kept no copies of any of them, and they were in general very hastily written.

† A very remarkable confession! See p. 210. of Mr Ewing's Attempt.

ble. But will it not also sometimes lead you to the bond? and would not your liberty and comfort in studying the Scriptures still be augmented, if, like the Confession of Faith, it were done away? The benefit of the first change, you observe, "has been felt by many," and surely, without occasioning "a predisposition to changes in general," the benefit of the latter would be experienced also.

On the whole, so far from supposing that there is any thing improper or unjust in calling on you to give up the house, I am only yielding to what duty appears to me to demand, while I am not actuated by any covetous principle, or by dislike to you. I wish too solemnly to warn others who may be afterwards placed in circumstances similar to those in which I stood, never to deviate so far from the line of duty, under the idea of doing a service acceptable to God, as to place their talents, by a legal instrument, at the disposal of another person, however highly they may esteem him. This is a very different thing from laying down property at the feet of an apostle. I am strongly persuaded, that you would not now do the same thing, or advise it in the case of another. Am I mistaken in this? Or would it not, both in the gift and acceptance, be altogether wrong? "Such things" as "securities," you tell Mr Brown, "are very rarely to be found among Dissenters*." If this be to their praise, is it not a pity that they should ever be found among them?

I have informed Mr Harley and you, that pecuniary reimbursement is not my object, and that I only wish to recover the application of my talents from being subservient to a system, which I conceive to be exerting itself in opposition to reformation and the advancement

* Exposure, Mr Ewing, pag. 8.

of the gospel, and to restore them to a lawful direction. If you now purchase the house, or give it up, it is my intention to apply, without delay, what I receive from the property, in translating and multiplying copies of the Scriptures. This, you will observe, is paying away the value of the whole, which would, in course, at length revert to my estate. Of the importance of this object, especially in the present situation of the world, and with the facilities now afforded for circulating the word of God, there can be only one opinion.

I am, my dear Sir, &c.

The following is a Copy of the Deed referred to.

IT IS CONTRACTED and AGREED between the parties following, viz. ROBERT HALDANE, Esq. of Airthrey, heritable proprietor of the subject after mentioned, ON THE ONE PART, and the REVEREND MR GREVILLE EWING, minister of the gospel, ON THE OTHER, in manner underwritten, THAT IS TO SAY, The said Robert Haldane hath set, and by these presents, under the special conditions and provisions after mentioned, in Tack and Assedation, lets to the said Mr Greville Ewing, but excluding his heirs and assignees, both voluntary and legal, and likewise subtenants, ALL and WHOLE that tenement lying and situated on the west side of Jamaica Street, in the city of Glasgow, lately known by the name of the Circus, but now fitted up by the said Robert Haldane for a chapel or place of public worship, with free ish and entry thereto, and the whole privileges and pertinents of the same, to be

occupied and possessed by the said Mr Greville Ewing as a place of public worship, and for no other use or purpose whatsoever, AND THAT from the day and date of these presents, ay and so long as the said Mr Greville Ewing shall continue statedly and personally to officiate as minister, by preaching the gospel and dispensing divine ordinances in the said place of public worship, and no longer; without hindrance, nevertheless, to the said Mr Greville Ewing to make occasional visits or journies when he shall think expedient; WITH power to him to uplift the seat-rents in the said tenement, and the collections or offerings bestowed at the said chapel from time to time during his ministry there, and to apply the same for the maintenance and support of himself and his family, to the extent of TWO HUNDRED pounds Sterling per annum, and no more; BUT PROVIDING ALWAYS, that no rent whatsoever shall be exacted or taken for those seats in the said chapel or place of public worship, known by the name of common seats, which are to be open and patent to all persons choosing to sit in them at all times when divine worship is performed: Which tack, under the provision above mentioned, and the other conditions herein underwritten, the said Robert Haldane hereby obliges himself, his heirs and successors, to warrant to be good and effectual to the said Mr Greville Ewing during the period above written, at all hands and against all deadly, as law will. FOR WHICH CAUSES, and on the other part, the said Mr Greville Ewing hereby BINDS himself, and ENGAGES, when health enables him, to officiate statedly and personally as minister in the aforesaid chapel, and to preach the gospel, and to dispense divine ordinances therein, from time to time, as before mentioned, and to levy and col-

lect by himself, or others of his appointment, the seat-rents yearly, and also the offerings given in the said chapel, or at the doors thereof, from time to time, when divine worship is performed there, excepting occasional collections for particular objects; and after retaining, in the FIRST place, the said sum of two hundred pounds Sterling yearly, for the maintenance of himself and family: SECONDLY, The ground-rents or feu-duties payable to the superior of the area on which the said chapel is built, or any other person entitled to receive the same, and which the said Mr Greville Ewing is to pay accordingly once every year, and to report discharges thereof to the said Robert Haldane: THIRDLY, The ordinary expences of the house, such as cleaning and lighting the same, and the beadles or door-keepers salaries, or other perquisites: and, FOURTHLY, The necessary repairs of the said house; then to account for, and pay over the residue and remainder of the said seat-rents and offerings or collections, to the said Robert Haldane, Mr James Haldane, his brother, Mr William Innes, minister of the gospel, lately in Stirling, now in Dundee, and the said Mr Greville Ewing himself, and the survivors or survivor of them, to be by them or him applied for training up and educating young men to the ministry of the gospel in Scotland; BUT PROVIDING always, that if the aforesaid seat-rents and offerings or collections shall not amount to the said sum of two hundred pounds Sterling yearly, for the support of the said Mr Greville Ewing, besides the feu-duties or ground-rents, the ordinary expences and repairs, then the said Robert Haldane and his aforesaid, shall be holden and obliged to satisfy and pay the said feu-duties or ground-rents and repairs of the building, and to relieve the said Greville Ewing of the same, in so far as the said seat-rents and collections shall fall short of, or

be insufficient for paying the same. AND BOTH parties oblige themselves, their heirs and executors, to implement and fulfil to each other their respective parts of the premises, and the party failing to pay to the party observing, or willing so to do, the sum of FIFTY pounds Sterling of penalty besides performance; and consent to the registration hereof in the books of Council and Session, or any other competent record therein, to remain for preservation, and that all legal execution necessary may pass and be directed, upon a decree to be interponed thereto in proper form; and for that effect, they CONSTITUTE
their procurators. In witness whereof, the said parties have subscribed these presents, consisting of this and the three preceding pages, written on paper duly stamped conform to law, &c.

Edinburgh, 2d Nov. 1801.

SIR,

ALTHOUGH by the tack of the Tabernacle at Glasgow between you and me, dated 8th July 1799, it is stipulated, that after retaining the sum therein mentioned yearly, for the maintenance of yourself and family, paying the ground-rent or feu-duties to the superior, the ordinary expences of the house, and the necessary repairs of it, you are to account for, and pay over the residue and remainder of the seat-rents, and offerings or collections at the said Tabernacle, or place of public worship, to me and the other persons therein named, to be applied for the uses therein mentioned; yet I hereby declare, that after the other payments above mentioned, before you shall be accountable for the said residue of

the seat-rents and offerings or collections, you shall also be entitled to pay yearly to an assistant minister, to be appointed by you, such salary as the said seat-rents, offerings and collections can afford or admit of, not exceeding the sum of one hundred pounds Sterling yearly, to commence from and after the term of Martinmas in this present year. I am, &c.

To Mr Greville Ewing. R. H.

CONCLUSION.

THE above is a copy of the deed by which Mr Ewing holds the Tabernacle at Glasgow. How strikingly dissimilar is this instrument to any thing in the scriptures connected with the kingdom of Jesus Christ! Those arrangements which regulate and secure the possession of lawful property He left as he found them, commanding his subjects to be obedient to the powers under which they lived, because civil government was appointed of God. In their worldly transactions therefore, both among themselves and other men, they might make use of legal obligations, sanctioned and enforced by the power of the magistrate. But in the affairs of his kingdom they were taught that nothing of this kind could have a place. Love, and a sense of obedience to their Lord, were to be the basis from first to last of their services to him, and the bond of their union one with another. The authority of the King was declared, the kingdom established, the character of its subjects described, and

the laws were promulgated by which they were to conduct themselves both as societies and individuals. Nothing then remained for those who were willing to be his followers, but to walk together in implicit submission to Jesus, and to enter on the immediate enjoyment of all the privileges which their union with him secured. We accordingly read in Scripture of no preliminary settlement among the disciples before they united for his worship.

Far less was their union ever suspended for a moment, on civil contracts or worldly obligations in any form. Previous, and in order to their association, we hear of no acts of legislature that were passed; no confessions of faith that were drawn up; no church covenants that were entered into. Neither were there any *stamped bonds* extended, in order to settle the permanent possession of a house, without obtaining which Christians would not enter into fellowship—in order to secure a maintenance for himself and his family, by a right to levy the tribute and collections of a promiscuous multitude, to one who was appointed the Bishop for life, before the society over which he was to preside was in existence—in order to vest in him the uncontrolled election and continuance of an assistant in office—and to bind and oblige him to preach the gospel and to dispense divine ordinances, under the penalty of a sum of money to be forfeited, *besides performance*, if he should neglect to do so! Surely it is not from the want of "a minute detail of the formation and practice of the primitive churches," that we have not even "an occasional hint or allusion," from which we might "infer," that something of this kind existed among them *.

Such however is actually the tenor of the foregoing bond. I conceived it in ignorance, and I now profess

* See Mr Ewing's Attempt, &c. preface, p. 3.

my repentance of so palpable a violation of the principles of the kingdom of Christ. In the foregoing letters, I have stated the grounds on which I have called on Mr Ewing to renounce it. This I deemed to be my duty, on account of the evil which the transaction involves.

I have also stated, that I was entitled to expect that he would restore the property, because he has forsaken the principles on the profession of which he obtained it. I gave it to him as a reformer, and as one willing and desirous to carry on that plan of reformation on which, although I was at first far from fully comprehending it, and therefore I am sensible was often counteracting the design, I have invariably proceeded to this hour.

I by no means expected that we were always to agree in our sentiments concerning the detail, far less that he should adopt without conviction any opinions of mine. But I did expect, and the whole of my proceedings towards him implies it, that he would continue steady to that principle on which our agreement proceeded, when I gave him such a proof of my confidence. Mr Ewing has published a number of books both before and since my putting him in possession of the Tabernacle. In these the principle I refer to is frequently brought forward in various ways. The motto of these publications might be inscribed in his own words. 'There 'is now abroad in the world a spirit of universal inqui-'ry. Let those who have an interest in the support of 'error and delusion, sigh and lament it. We are the 'friends of truth: we are the ardent lovers of impartial 'inquiry; and therefore wish neither to do nor to say 'any thing that may have a tendency to discourage or 'repress it.'

From the principles however on which the plan proceeded, which was well described by himself on his go-

ing to Glasgow, when he gave it out, that his design was to restore the brethren to their proper situation in the churches, from which they had been displaced, he has at length receded; and has published a book, containing principles of a very contrary tendency. One great end kept in view throughout this book, is to stamp the character of fickleness on those whom he opposes. Yet *his sentiments on several of the most important subjects that he has now brought forward, are contrary to what he has formerly published, and many of the most material passages of scripture on which in this work he grounds his present system, have been quoted by him in his former publications in that very sense which he now opposes.*

In so remarkable a TERGIVERSATION, a full acknowledgment of a change might have been expected; but whoever looks for this will be disappointed. The change is in general carefully concealed. For instance, the evidence from Scripture for the ordinance of public exhortation in the church by the brethren, from Heb. x. 25. formerly struck Mr Ewing so forcibly that it was the first thing which convinced him that he was wrong in remaining in the church of Scotland. This fact he frequently related for many years. Yet in his late book, at page 174. he says, 'It seems a reasonable question, where is the account of the institution of this ordinance? To this question we confess that we have never seen, and are unable to give a satisfactory answer.'

In one instance, however, Mr Ewing does confess a change. He says as follows: 'In Mr ROBERTSON'S pamphlet about lay-preaching, there are certainly many things, which we are not likely ever to approve. One sentence, however, has struck us of late, with peculiar force. "It is clear as noon day, says he, that any

" system which holds forth a slight preparation as ne-
" cessary for the ministry, tends to degrade that office
" in the eyes of mankind ; *and is likely in the end, to ter-*
" *minate in another system, in which any few individuals*
" *may erect themselves into a church, and mutually adminis-*
" *ter the ordinances of the gospel to one another.*" This
' sentence we once treated as an unfounded and wild
' conjecture ; it becomes us honestly to confess now,
' that events have given to it the appearance of a pro-
' phecy. Our practice hitherto, has, no doubt, favour-
' ed the opinion, that a slight preparation for the minis-
' try is sufficient *.'

The preceding confession, although the only one I recollect in his book, is a very material one in regard to the subject of the foregoing letters. Mr Ewing KNOWS WELL, that it was in consequence of his professing an agreement with me in *principle* when we began our co-operation, that *I put him in possession of the Tabernacle*, and gave him the tuition of the class. If I am not misinformed, Mr Ewing, in consulting about the validity of the bond, stated to his lawyer the change in his system, which formerly held forth a slight preparation as necessary for the ministry, in order to ascertain whether this would *affect him in law*. I have not been reasoning with him on legal principles, but on those of equity and the gospel. Besides the illegality of the bond, we here come to a distinct issue in the business. Mr Ewing admits, nay he comes voluntarily forward to confess, that Mr Robertson's conclusion concerning what our system would terminate in, is so fairly drawn that it has the appearance of a prophecy. We are then unavoidably arrived at that point in our practice, at which the principles on which

* N. B. The above is printed exactly as in Mr Ewing's book, pp. 163, 164.

we set out are put to the test. I adhere to them. Every step I take I am the more confirmed that they are the principles of the kingdom of Christ. Mr Ewing turns his back. He refuses the practice, and abandons the principles. If then it is now demonstrated, that he never understood, or has not adhered to the principles on which I gave him the house; that he finds I was deceived in regard to him when I put it in his power, although I most readily admit he did not intend to deceive; will he after this take a legal advantage, and retain my property? It is impossible. Will he after this speak of my immorality in demanding it back? To himself be the wrong if he so speak. *He is bound on the principles of common honesty to restore that house.*

In a letter I lately received, a correspondent says, 'I am truly surprised at Mr Ewing's conduct towards 'you. I think the common principles of honour, which 'regulate the conduct of worldly men, would induce him 'to restore to you your property. I do not know how 'his feelings can allow him to be so much indebted to 'you, after receding from the principles on which your 'friendship commenced, and treating you as he has done 'in his book *.'

* The following extract from the letter of another correspondent many hundred miles distant from the one above quoted, may serve to shew the necessity there is for this publication, in order to remove misrepresentation.—'Being in company last night, your 'transactions with Mr Ewing about the Tabernacle, Glasgow, 'was the subject of conversation. One in the company asserted, 'that he was informed you had prosecuted Mr Ewing at law, to 'give up the Tabernacle. This is at present the talk among the 'religious in this place. I would like to be in possession of the 'truth of any transaction that may have lately been between you 'and Mr Ewing. I wonder how, on the principles of worldly 'honour, not to speak of the principles of the gospel, he can hold 'your property.'

I must here express my surprise that the foregoing sentence quoted from Mr Robertson, should bear to Mr Ewing the appearance of a prophecy. The very thing supposed to be predicted, he steadily contemplated, and warmly recommended, in his "animadversions," published immediately after Mr Robertson's book. The very issue in which our system was to terminate, and which has actually been realized, is there brought forward by Mr Ewing with great triumph, in a long quotation, which he introduces by saying, that 'a more complete confutation of this gentleman's absurdities, or a more able exposure of priestcraft and clerical ambition in general, could not have been written *.' The following is part of his quotation.

'It has been said, that in the extraordinary and unsettled state of the church, the sacred offices were not so much appropriated to the ministers, as to exclude private Christians from occasionally exercising them, especially in the absence of the former. The first order given to the eleven *to make converts* (for such is the import of μαθητευσατε) *to baptize and to teach*, carries in it nothing from which we can discover, that it was a commission entrusted to them exclusively as apostles or ministers, and not given them also as Christians †; and that the apostles were particularized, because best qualified, from their long attendance ou Christ's ministry, for promoting his religion in the world; but not with a view to exclude any Christians, who were capable, from co-operating with them in the same good cause. That this last was the construction then put

* Animadversions on Mr R. by Mr E. p. 45.

† There can be no doubt that others were to baptize and to teach; but certainly the commission referred to was exclusively delivered to the apostles.

'upon that charge, appears not improbable, from the 'subsequent part of the Scripture history. Philip, 'though no apostle, and probably at that time no more 'than a deacon, (that is, a trustee for the poor in mat-'ters purely secular) did all to the Ethiopian eunuch, 'which the apostles had in charge with regard to all 'nations. He converted, baptized, and taught him. 'No reasonable man can doubt that any private Chris-'tian was then, and is still, warranted, if he can, to con-'vert an infidel, and to teach him the principles of 'Christianity. Yet these are two important parts of 'the apostolical commission. If I should say the most 'important parts, I should not speak without warrant. 'Our Lord himself made proselytes, and instructed them, 'but baptized none, leaving this merely ministerial 'work to his disciples. Peter was sent to open the 'door of faith to the Gentiles, by the conversion of 'Cornelius and his family. But the charge of baptiz-'ing them he trusted entirely to the Christian brethren 'who attended him. Ananias, a disciple, was employed 'to baptize Paul. And Paul says himself of his own 'mission, that Christ sent him not to baptize, but to 'preach the gospel, denoting thereby, according to the 'import of the Hebrew idiom, that baptizing compa-'red with preaching, though a part, was but an inferior 'and subordinate part of his charge. Nothing here ad-'vanced can justly be understood to combat the pro-'priety of limiting, for the sake of discipline, the 'power of baptizing to fewer hands than that of preach-'ing, when once a fixed ministry is settled in a church, 'and regulations are adopted for its government.

'The doctrine I have been illustrating, so far from 'being, as some romanists ignorantly pretend, one of 'the many novelties sprung from the protestant schism, 'was openly maintained at Rome without censure, a-

'bout the middle of the fourth century, by Hilary, a 'deacon of that church, a man of erudition and discern- 'ment, of whom I shall have occasion to speak after- 'wards. This commentator, in his exposition of the 'epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 11, 12. has these words: "Postquam omnibus locis ecclesiæ sunt constitutæ, et "officia ordinata, aliter composita res est, quam cœperat; "primum enim omnes docebant, et omnes baptizabant, "quibuscunque diebus vel temporibus fuisset occasio*." 'A little after; "Neque Petrus diaconos habuit quan- "do Cornelium cum omni domo ejus baptizavit; nec "ipse; sed jussit fratribus qui cum illo ierant ad Cor- "nelium ab Joppe†." Again: "Ut ergo cresceret plebs, "et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est "et evangelizare, et baptizare, et scripturas in ecclesia "explanare‡." Such were the sentiments of a respect- 'able member of the Roman presbytery in those days; 'for conclave, both in name and thing, was as little 'known at Rome then as it is with us at present. Now 'though the gradual settlement of a regular ministry 'throughout the church, would gradually abolish an 'usage of this kind, it is natural to conclude, that 'wherever there happened to be a return of the like 'exigencies, through want of licensed pastors, every 'private Christian would not only be entitled, but

* After churches were planted in all places, and offices appointed, things were otherwise conducted than at the beginning; for at first all taught, and all baptized, on whatever days or seasons it was needful.

† Neither had Peter deacons along with him when he baptized Cornelius with all his house; nor did he do it himself; but commanded the brethren to do it who had accompanied him from Joppa to Cornelius.

‡ Therefore that the people might increase and be multiplied, all were allowed in the beginning to preach the gospel, and to baptize, and to explain the Scriptures in the church.

'bound, if capable, to supply the defect. So thought 'the Christians, who were dispersed on the persecution 'mentioned Acts viii. For "they that were scattered 'abroad," the historian makes no distinction, "went 'every where preaching the word." Now the apostles 'remained in Jerusalem, and ordinary pastors were not 'yet appointed. This is agreeable to what appears to 'have been the general opinion, and even the practice 'where circumstances required, as far down as Ter-'tullian's time, about the beginning of the third cen-'tury. This author, the first of the Latin fathers, in 'his *Exhortatio ad castitatem*, wherein he inveighs against 'second marriages, having urged that Paul made it ne-'cessary in a bishop that he be the husband of one wife, 'introduces an antagonist replying, that the prohibition 'to pastors implies a permission to others to marry 'oftener. He answers, that the distinction among 'Christians, between the priesthood and the people, 'who, by the evangelical law, are all priests, is of the 'church's making, that is, as I understand him, is not 'of divine original; referring to what appears to have 'been the approved practice of laymen even then, who, 'when none of the clerical order could be had, celebra-'ted the eucharist, and baptized, and served as priests 'to themselves. "Three persons," says he, "though 'laymen, make a church." "Ubi ecclesiastici ordinis 'non est consessus, et offers, et tinguis, et sacerdos es 'tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici *." It 'matters nothing to the present question, that his doc-'trine of the unlawfulness of second marriages is un-'reasonable; it matters nothing, that his argument is

* When there is not a meeting of the ecclesiastical order, you both observe the Lord's supper, and baptize, and serve as a priest to yourself alone. But where there are three, it is a church, although they be laymen.

'inconclusive; we are concerned only with the fact, to 'which he refers as notorious *.'

Is it possible for any one to recollect what Mr Ewing has written in his book on church government, and to read the above without astonishment! In order to confute Mr Robertson, he triumphantly proves from Scripture, by his quotation, that the brethren in the time of the apostles were *authorized to baptize, as well as to preach the gospel.* He asserts that the Christians who were dispersed from Jerusalem *acted in this manner;* and that it is natural to conclude that whenever such exigencies occurred through want of pastors, *private Christians* would not only be *entitled*, but *bound*, if capable, to supply the defect. This view of the matter, he says, so far from being properly ranked amongst novelties, sprung up from the Protestant schism, as some *Romanists ignorantly pretend*, was openly maintained at Rome in the fourth century. And further, he affirms that within one hundred years after the apostles, it was 'the approved practice,' a thing admitted, *that three Christians without a bishop made a church; and that it was lawful for the brethren, when there were no pastors present, both to baptize and to observe the Lord's supper.* In his late book, he opposes, even with ridicule, such sentiments; and so far from acknowledging that he himself was the first to bring them publicly forward, he treats them, like the '*ignorant Romanists*,' as if they were unheard-of novelties. Concerning the observance of the Lord's supper without a pastor, he now speaks of arguments which 'the *advocates* of the opinion are obli-'ged to use, and the unavoidable consequences of adopt-'ing *their* system,' p. 135. In regard to churches, he observes, p. 127. 'Any two Christians, it is said, are a 'church. Meet with your friend and the shadow ap-

* Animadversions, &c. p. 57.—60.

'pears, leave him and it is gone. 'Tis here, 'tis there, 'tis gone!'—'Again, they maintain, that any two 'Christians make a church, and that any meeting of 'Christians on the Lord's day, however casual, am- 'bulatory, and even private (if strangers be not ab- 'solutely excluded) may act, in all respects, as a 'church. In short, any company of Christians is a 'church; and a church, though destitute of office- 'bearers, is every thing. If two or three of my fa- 'mily be agreed, as Christians, to meet together on 'the Lord's day, whether we be visited or not by a neigh- 'bour or two of the same description; it is only neces- 'sary for somebody to give thanks, before bread and 'wine are handed about, and this may be done, as show- 'ing the Lord's death till he come, although the meeting 'were purely accidental. This is no overcharged imagi- 'nary picture. It is taken from what is known to have 'been done*.' Mr Ewing affirms, that his picture is taken from what is *known* to have been done. At present, I say nothing of the sentiments which he here misrepresents, and endeavours to make ridiculous. I call his attention to what he has advanced as a fact. I take it for granted, that he refers to Mr Ballantine and me. If so, I inform him that his picture is taken from what is known *not* to have been done. Does Mr Ewing recollect the manner in which he addressed Professor Robinson, when the latter brought forward an unfounded statement, saying, that he "understood" so and so to be the case? Mr Ewing's language is much more explicit, "it is known to have been done."

Let us now look for a moment to the foundation on which, in the beginning of the chapter, (on the duties of office-bearers in a church, from which the above is taken), Mr Ewing builds all that he says respecting

* Pag. 137.

the observance of the Lord's supper without elders, p. 130. 'The dispensing of the Lord's supper *seems* also to be-'long to the office of the bishop; and as this ordinance '*seems* always to suppose the meeting of a church, we '*presume* it falls *more* exclusively than the other* within 'his province.' If Mr Ewing hesitated on the point, whether the ordinance of the Lord's supper belonged exclusively to a church, ought not this to have been the first part of his inquiry? As this is omitted, in what light shall we view his *confident reasonings that follow on the subject, connected as they are, with such a foundation as is here laid?* But perhaps from his own practice he might feel that there was cause to hesitate. Did not Mr Ewing observe the Lord's supper with a missionary society, or does he not approve their practice? He knows that in his writings he has made a distinction between missionary societies and churches. It may be difficult to comprehend why the observance of the Lord's supper without a pastor, any more than the observance of other ordinances in such circumstances, should be *subversive of the pastoral office;* but if this be really the case, as he has given us to understand, p. 142. does it not *seem* to follow, that to observe it without a church is *subversive of the institution of a church?*

What Mr Ewing calls Mr Robertson's "absurdities," were the principles which the latter advanced against lay-preaching. Lay-preaching, and exhortation in the church by the brethren, are only different modifications of the same question. The principles which prove the one establish the other; and we cannot be consistent unless we admit or reject both. When I gave Mr Ewing the Tabernacle, he was the strenuous advocate both of lay-preaching and exhortation. Indeed their intro-

* *Viz.* baptism, the dispensing of which he had said before, "*seems* to belong to the office of the bishop."

duction was essential to the avowed design of the restoration of the brethren to their place in the churches. Exhortation was accordingly brought into the week-day meetings of the churches without a moment's hesitation. For years no doubt was expressed of its being an institution of the Lord. At length, however, it was perceived, that, from the same principle on which we attended to it on a week-day, it necessarily followed that it must be observed on the Lord's day. This consequence, which could not well be controverted, caused at first much uneasiness, and at length as violent an ebullition among ourselves, as the question of lay-preaching had formerly occasioned in the church of Scotland. As the inquiry, however, could not be quashed, it became absolutely necessary for those who opposed exhortation on the first day of the week, completely to shift their ground respecting this ordinance. Accordingly Mr Ewing, who had been the first to introduce it, *renounced it altogether*. And in regard to the meeting on Friday evening, which, by his printed regulations, was constituted by himself a *church-meeting* for exhortation, &c. he has now constituted it "a fellowship society on a large scale," although all the discipline of the church is still transacted in it. In this singular revolution, the church itself appears to have been entirely passive.

Lay-preaching and exhortation must either stand or fall together. It is therefore time for Mr Ewing to declare what he thinks now of Mr Robertson's "absurdities." Whoever reads the papers of controversy on lay-preaching will perceive, that at the beginning it was constantly interwoven by our brethren with the subject of exhortation. To shew their affinity, it may be noticed, that James iii. 1. "My brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater con-

demnation," was formerly quoted by Dr Erskine and Mr Robertson *against lay-preaching*, and is now quoted by Mr Ewing and Mr Aikman *against exhortation*. It does not affect the question that they have all mistaken the meaning of the passage, which speaks neither of exhortation nor of lay-preaching, but, as is evident from its connection, is a warning against censoriousness and evil-speaking.

Of Mr Ewing's late book I shall take this opportunity to observe, that it is one which might have been brought forward with less confidence. A very satisfactory refutation of it might be compiled from his former works.

Mr Ewing has laid down principles which, if they could be established, would overthrow many things that Christians hold most dear. In his preface, he has instituted an unfounded and pernicious distinction between the manner in which the Scriptures teach Christians, as individuals, and as societies. He has first endeavoured to shew, that the rule for Christian fellowship is uncertain, and indistinct; and he has reduced the whole to bare probability. Afterwards, in contradiction to himself, he supposes that there is no rule at all, otherwise he asserts it would have been more minutely described: and he observes, that Christians equally wise and good conscientiously differ on the subject. Here he lays the evil of their differences to the charge of the obscurity of the word of God, instead of imputing it, as he ought to have done, to their own culpable inattention and depravity. And thus he exhibits the Scriptures by which we shall all be judged, in a light that would justly discredit any law of human society, and prove that it was unworthy of the name, and ought to be immediately rescinded.

In his second chapter, by a large compilation from

Benson and Macknight on miraculous gifts, he has separated between the first and the present churches. This reduces the rule of duty in every thing respecting the latter to the most hopeless uncertainty, or rather annihilates it altogether. For if the circumstance of the possession of spiritual gifts is to change the order established for the churches under the eye of the apostles, and recorded in their epistles in examples and precepts, we have nothing else to which we can resort. He has debarred the exhortation of the brethren in the church, although these gifts were bestowed on them: and the application of the same rule will for ever silence all the bishops. He has indeed provided a door to escape from this last perplexing result, by *supposing* that learning in the bishop is appointed to be a succedaneum for these gifts. But even after the translation he has adopted from Macknight, of Ephesians iv. 7.—16. he can only prove, on his own principles, that it was competent for those men who possessed the gifts to instruct others. This borrowed statement, then, concerning the miraculous gifts, after having levelled every thing in the church, is finally destructive of Mr Ewing's own scheme.

The rule of our duty in the Word of God is too well adjusted and connnected to allow one part of it to be interfered with, without injuring or destroying the rest. The subject Mr Ewing had in view was the fellowship of believers, but while he defaces the beauty of this order he cuts deep in another quarter at which the stroke was not aimed. The presence of the Spirit of God to dwell with his disciples to the end of time was promised by Jesus, and is secured to every believer, as the grand peculiarity of the new covenant. Continual reference is made to this subject in the apostolic epistles, where it is expressly brought forward in various places. Benson and Macknight, in consistency with themselves,

explain such passages to refer to the spiritual gifts ; and Mr Ewing by adopting their views has surrendered them up as inapplicable to the present state of believers. Here then is a chasm indeed produced in the Scriptures, and what shall supply its place ?

But what is it in the whole Bible that will stand before such rules of interpretation as Mr Ewing proceeds on, both in his preface and dissertation upon gifts ; which form the basis of his book. The duty of discipline in the churches, as well as that of exhortation ; the duties of prayer and praise ; the observance of the Lord's supper ; the duty of attending to it every Lord's day ; the appointment of office bearers ; the very existence of any church ;——the sanctification of the Lord's day ; the inspiration of the whole of the New Testament, on which every thing depends from first to last ; all are for ever exploded. The evidence of all or any of them, yielding at best only bare probability, and depending on the reasoning faculty of each individual, must never henceforth be confidently urged on any man, with the high claim of divine authority !

THE church which assembles in the Tabernacle at Glasgow, must necessarily feel themselves interested in the subject of the foregoing letters. Hitherto it is probable that few of them have had any information about the bond. They are parties however in the business, are deeply concerned in it, and it ought to be considered by them with that solemn attention which is due to every thing that relates to the law of God.

A few weeks ago, before I determined to publish

these letters, I shewed them to some individuals in Glasgow. They all with one voice, so far as I have learned, condemn the transaction of the bond in a religious light. It has indeed been said, that it is binding in a civil point of view. I have particularly noticed in the first sentence of my letters, that this is not the ground on which I am proceeding. As I was dealing with persons who consider themselves subject to the rule of the Scriptures, I deemed it to be evidently just and proper to reason on Christian principles. Upon these, I have proved it to be contrary to the Christian law, and therefore, as a transaction in the kingdom of Christ, null and void.

It has been alleged, that the church was gathered by Mr Ewing, on the provision of possessing the Tabernacle during his life. The obligation from me is only during his incumbency; and I may venture to say, that even for that period the church has no grant or promise of it from him. If any such thing were even implied, it could only be so while their judgment coincided with Mr Ewing's; and the first difference between them and him would infer their exclusion, while the bond secures the house and its emoluments, independent of any church. The truth is, that very few, I suppose, excepting three or four individuals, have known any thing particular about the matter. To them I stated, immediately after Mr Ewing went to Glasgow, that I thought it would be the duty of the church which should assemble in that house, as soon as possible, to pay interest for the price of it, and to clear the debt, and make it their own, which I observed they ought to endeavour to do in the course of ten years.

Even supposing that the church had been gathered by Mr Ewing, on the provision of having the Tabernacle during his life, the impropriety of which would

be sufficiently manifest, he can be under no obligation to hold the house, if it be wrong in a religious point of view, any more than he could be urged to retain a civil possession for others, when there was a flaw discovered in the tenure; for no man can convey a right which does not belong to himself. The transaction then being purely religious, will be viewed by a religious society in that light. They will not desire to retain what on their own proper principles they are not entitled to; and they will certainly feel the duty of now at length providing a house for themselves. If the bond or lease be wrong in a religious view, they will admit that to adhere to it would be a violation of the law of God, though not of the law of the land.

The church was gathered not only under the burden of a bond, but also of a set of printed regulations, to "*be read to every member upon admission into the church, for his or her acquiescence or approbation.*" These regulations are now done away. The very first of them has been publicly denounced by the pastor, without however, I believe, the acquiescence of the church being asked. It was an ominous business indeed, to have a *stamped bond* and *printed regulations* placed between the Bible and a Christian church! But if Mr Ewing be at liberty thus to abandon the one, is he not also at liberty to abandon the other? Or shall worldly interest prove a temptation to make a distinction between them?

If again, usefulness, and the opportunity of collecting many hearers, should be pleaded for making a difference, must not usefulness still be aimed at only in the path of duty? Besides, can that system be scriptural, by which so numerous a church finds itself obliged continually to be indebted to one, with

whom they have broken off all religious connection, for what is necessary to provide for the worship of God, and the duty they owe to others? We read of no dilemma like this in the Scriptures, and the system that supposes it must necessarily be wrong.

There is one subject that has been touched on in the letters, to which I hope the brethren will turn their attention. The church holds it to be their duty to support their pastor; yet he is maintained in another way, in which the evil of the bond strikingly discovers itself. The money that has been levied from the seat-rents and public collections of the whole promiscuous multitude, believers and unbelievers, is delivered into the hands of a *treasurer*, by whom it is laid out according to previous stipulations, without the church knowing any thing of the matter, or having in the smallest degree the power of regulating or proportioning what is to be given, according to circumstances. Thus what they declare to be their duty, never comes under their cognizance at all. In fact, they have no more claim to be consulted in the business, than the rest of the congregation. It is by his hearers promiscuously, as is provided by the bond, that the pastor is maintained; and if there were to be any consulting as to the destination of the funds, all who contribute have an equal right to appear. But were the whole assembled, and even the Bible appealed to, the bond would come forward and silence them all, and the Bible also.

Even supposing the bond removed, and that the money collected were to go through the hands of the church, and to be presented to the pastor, have they considered the manner in which it is procured? I suppose they will all agree, that nothing ought to be done in the church of Christ but by his authority, and that the introduction of any other principle, under whatever mo-

dification, is the very essence of antichrist. Let us read with attention the 8th and 9th chapters of 2 Corinthians, and observe in what manner, and by what arguments, the ambassador of the Lord urges obedience to the duty of contribution, which he there enjoins. His arguments are all drawn from one source. They can influence none but believers, and these, no further than as they are looking to things unseen. "Ye know the grace," says he, "of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." And "he that soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly." If such motives failed, he had no others to which he could have recourse. Let these principles then be urged as far as possible to direct our conduct, but let nothing be resorted to that would tend to press the matter farther. The point where any thing like compulsion, the force of custom, the desire of receiving honour from men, or avoiding their censure, in however small a degree, begins to operate, there the influence of the love of Jesus ends. Whatever else besides his authority intrudes itself into the temple of God, is the avowed or secret working of that man of sin, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God.

Have these considerations been attended to by the church? Their practice hitherto declares, that it is otherwise. A collection is made after the Lord's supper, when each member of the church gives as he purposeth in his heart. What is thus collected, is applied for certain things. But why are not all those things for which money is wanted, and which are considered by the church to be the ordinances of Christ, included as the object of this contribution? To this no good answer can be returned. And some of them are provided for in another manner,

either because entire reliance is not placed on the influence of the principles before stated, or in order that those who are "without" may be included when contributions are made. Both of these motives are corrupt and unscriptural; and each of them, it is to be feared, have their influence in this business. As dependence is not placed upon the more private contribution after the Lord's supper, an additional collection is made at the door when the members enter the house, when a deacon observes what each one gives as he passes. Even this is deemed insufficient; and a third method is resorted to which amounts to positive compulsion. Every member of the church is *expected* to rent a seat for himself and his family. This impost, as it may be properly called, falls very unequally, owing to the varying numbers in families, and is not therefore proportioned to the circumstances of the members. It also introduces an improper distinction in the church; for those who can least afford it, must occupy the more inconvenient or distant seats behind, which are let at a lower price than others. Thus the church is called on to contribute when they enter the house, and when they go out of the house, and half-yearly in private, otherwise they are deprived of their seats. Is not all this exactly regulated according to the practice of the world, the direct and indirect taxes, and the voluntary contributions of the state? With these we find no fault. Human government must be adapted to the principles of human nature. When one method fails, another is resorted to, and the appeal must ultimately be made to force, otherwise things would soon stand still. Not so the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Whatever plausible reasoning may be used to shew the lawfulness of introducing or conniving at such plans among the subjects

of that kingdom, or however this business may be glossed over, there is, beyond a doubt, an evil lurking here, and the more the matter is investigated, the more fully will it be discovered.

But these arrangements are also intended to comprehend those that are "without;" for as they do not participate in the Lord's supper, were the whole contribution of the church to be made on that occasion, nothing could be obtained from them. They are therefore included by the collections at the door and by the seat-rents. Particular notice is taken of them also, whether or not they contribute at their going into the place of worship; and from the custom of the country, they in general consider themselves obliged to comply with what is expected. They must also pay for their seats, otherwise their conduct would be remarked. Their contributions then are not even voluntary—they are forced. Upon what principle is a church entitled to place contribution on a different footing from other ordinances, especially believing as they do, that those who in consequence are called to assist in it, labour under a mistake in giving their money? Is it even justice to receive from them in such circumstances? Why then is the church seen coming forward, stretching out its hands, inviting by signs, nay even calling by words on those who stand back from the other ordinances, or who are considered utterly unfit to attend to them, to take their part in this business?

Is there a trace of any such practice to be discovered in the Scriptures, in the history of the churches of Christ? Nothing of the kind appears. I hope this matter, if indeed it is to be controverted, will be fully discussed. Let the Scriptures be appealed to, and even the shadow of a foundation for such practices will not be found. Why not allow "them that are without"

equally to hold communion in all or any of the other ordinances? Why not invite them also to the Lord's table? It is utterly inconsistent with every principle of separation on which these churches began. This exception in our practice, the most suspicious in its appearance of any that could have been introduced, is a profanation of the temple, a blot in the epistle of Christ. It is very consistent in the established church, which proceeds upon the supposition that all the hearers are Christians, but most inconsistent in those who maintain a principle so opposite, and who act upon it in every thing, *except in receiving money*. This practice, on account of which formerly I take much shame to myself, forms the basis and support of all the corrupt systems of Christianity.

It has also a direct tendency to ruin the churches, not only by the internal evils which it fosters, but by introducing worldly influence. This effect has hitherto been retarded among these churches by a particular combination of circumstances. But its progress, though it should be slow at first, is ultimately certain. When people of the world are called on to pay their money, and when they observe, that on them in a considerable degree the support of the system devolves, they will soon expect, and afterwards demand, that their voice should be heard in different respects, *especially in the choice of pastors*. From the churches considering themselves to be required, whether they can afford it or not, to build houses to meet in, and also to obtain their elders from a distance, the effects of calling in the aid of the world have already been experienced. Many, I believe, have hitherto given their countenance to such proceedings from not particularly attending to their unscriptural nature and baneful consequences.

The bond has introduced another evil, which the

church should also consider. When the pastor stands in need of assistance on the Lord's day, young men from a distance, who are attending the College, are employed at the rate of a guinea or half-a-guinea to supply his place. Here is a practice sufficient to corrupt all the churches. Such a one, I believe, has never been admitted, in any shape, into some of the most worldly religious systems in Scotland. This practice, most unscriptural and unseemly in itself, and dangerous in its tendency, might well have been avoided, had its baneful effects elsewhere been considered. These young men are sometimes little known to the church; and although well versed in elocution, they are in general very ill qualified to teach a Christian church. Independent too of their want of maturity of knowledge and experience, their views of truth, and their manner of preaching, are often different from those which I believe are considered by the church to be according to scripture.

Instead of resorting to such a method of supply as this, or to the unscriptural device of having an *assistant* in office, in total dependence on the pastor, who may preach the gospel and statedly *teach* the church, but not *dispense THE ordinances*, as some are exclusively designated, would it not be better for the church, and for Mr Ewing when he requires help, to recur to the sentiments which he held, when he was not 'ashamed to confess,' that he had 'often been much more edified by 'the remarks which had occurred to a plain man upon 'a serious perusal of his English Bible, than by the 'lecture of a clergyman, who had collected for retail 'the jarring opinions of a mass of commentators *.' And when he conceived it 'to be the duty of the bre-'thren not to forsake the assembling themselves toge-

* Mr Ewing's Animadversions on Mr Robertson, p. 35.

'ther, but to exhort one another, that besides mutual 'edification, the gifts bestowed by the Head of the 'church may be discovered, exercised and approven, 'that those who have received them may be set apart 'to the work of the ministry *.' But even if such sentiments are now to be discarded, if the brethren must neither be allowed to exhort nor to pray in the church, still the want might be supplied in a different way from that which has been followed. There are some, it is said, in the church who are well qualified to preach the word of life, and who are in the habit of doing so in other places. Why are not these employed, and why are young men preferred to them? Has Mr Ewing forgotten the severe, though ludicrous terms in which, in his writings, he has reprehended the clergy of the church of Scotland for setting up young men to teach in their place?

I am happy to know that there are some in the church at Glasgow who have already turned their attention to the above practices, and are aware of their unscriptural nature. Let them and others go on to inquire with their Bible in their hands, using it as the lamp to their feet, and the light to their paths, and as able to make the simple wise. They can have no interest in any thing that is contrary to the Scriptures. If these practices are persisted in, it must be in direct opposition to the nature of the kingdom, and to the clearest principles of the word of God. My object is not to censure what is past, but to excite attention to present duty. Formerly we have all been much to blame. Let us repent and forsake what is wrong.

We should also remember that in proportion as truth is pressed upon us, it becomes more sinful and dangerous to resist it. The principles on which the

* Ditto, p. 44.

operations first proceeded that gave rise to these churches, materially involve what has been lately urged in regard to the fellowship of believers. When properly attended to, it cannot fail to be perceived, that there is now no consistency in remaining on the ground which many continue to occupy. To be consistent they must either go forward, or return whence they came, and repent on account of all the disturbance which they occasioned, when they separated from the other sects. I trust, however, they will rather press forward.

It is highly improper in itself, and always extremely dangerous, to endeavour to deter Christians from inquiry, by raising the cry of fickleness and change. We are all too apt "to seek our own," by endeavouring to maintain the character of consistency, even where there may be a lurking suspicion that it can only be preserved at the expence of truth, and of the obedience which we owe to God. But there is such a thing as fickleness; and it may be justly charged home when Christians recede from what they have already attained. If this charge can now be fairly repelled by any amongst us, it can only be done by following out the scriptural principles on which we commenced. As these principles have come to be better understood, the necessity of a variation of practice in many respects has been sufficiently apparent. But there may be, there often necessarily must be, a change in operation where there is the most complete stedfastness in principle. Owing to this distinction being frequently overlooked, Mr Ewing, throughout his book, has greatly the advantage over those whom he opposes.

In order that they to whose attention I would address these remarks may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works, it behoves them to discard the pernicious and

erroneous sentiment, too long fostered among us, that the word of God does not contain a rule for their social, as well as individual conduct. The want of unity in their fellowship among believers, accompanied as it must be with alienation of mind, which more than any thing else stumbles the world and perplexes the weak of the flock, ought to be viewed as a sin of no common magnitude. It is justly chargeable more or less upon us all, and, whatever may be supposed, discovers great evil, and much remaining aversion to the authority of God. Let none then be lulled asleep in the present unhappy state of things among Christians, by supposing that it is no impeachment of their *wisdom* and *goodness*, that they "cannot have the pleasure of stated fellowship *" in the service of God. If so, there must be a fault somewhere. Shall we charge this upon the Scriptures, and endeavour, as we have formerly done, to supply their deficiency by *regulations* and *bonds?* Rather let us all with deep humiliation lay our hands on our mouths, and apply to ourselves the language in which the Lord addressed his disciples, even in relation to the Scriptures of that period, when the vail remained on Moses' face, "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken!"

Let Mr Ewing depart from the sentiments which he has so incautiously advanced in the preface of his late book; although in other parts of it he has most inconsistently reasoned on an opposite principle. He must remember the connection † in which, when looking forward to the unclouded vision of the latter day, he could once quote these beautiful words, "Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice, with the voice together shall they sing: for

* Preface to Mr Ewing's Attempt, page 5.

† Whether their proper meaning restricts them to this connection, is a different question.

they shall see eye to eye when the Lord shall bring again Zion." The canon of Scripture is closed. The revelation of divine truth is now complete. He who hath testified these things saith, Surely I come quickly. And his disciples have no reason to expect any further declaration of his will, until they shall behold him in the clouds of heaven. All things are therefore recorded that are necessary in order to the full accomplishment of the object of that petition, which he put up for his people in the night in which he was betrayed. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe through their word: that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." This unity was in a great degree enjoyed in the first ages of the church, and the gospel had free course and was glorified. For ever then let the suggestion be silenced, that there is not a fault among us, while we "cannot" have fellowship in the worship of our heavenly Father. Let the people of God banish from among them the worldly obligations introduced by human wisdom, to make up for something that is supposed to be wanting to bind them together, and to enable them to draw the attention of unbelievers in order to convert them. Let them resort to the word of God, and to that alone, searching the Scriptures with all humility of mind. Then they shall discover that full provision is made for their complete union with Jesus, and consequently one with another. Then they shall see eye to eye. Then, instead of the clamour of strife, and mutual accusations, which drown the voice of conscience, and defeat the end of the commandment, which is love, we shall all be effectually knit together.

How poor are the substitutes for which this unity is

bartered, and by which it is opposed! Forgetting that the churches do not come together to make laws, but to obey them, and asserting a kind of undefined liberty of attending on the Lord's day to certain observances, or of setting them aside just as we choose. Making learning indispensable in the elders, which the word of God has not done; while their other qualifications are almost entirely overlooked. Supposing that nothing can be effected in the churches without a command of money, and power to build larger houses to meet in than they can afford; in order to obtain which, unscriptural obligations are resorted to, and even the contributions of the world required; as if the Lord were a hard master, demanding more of his people at any time than their circumstances will admit. These things first corrupt from the simplicity that is in Christ, and then circumscribe the gospel within the narrowest limits. All the money we can command, all the learning we possess, may be usefully employed; but let us beware of making any thing indispensable to the fellowship of believers, but what is enjoined in the word of God. Amidst the many trials and difficulties which the first disciples encountered, we read nothing in Scripture of any that arose from their poverty as a hindrance to the performance of their duty. The simplicity of the ordinances which they were called to observe, and the plainness of the Scriptures as the rule of life, placed it within the immediate reach of the smallest and poorest society of Christians, to unite for the purpose of building themselves up in their most holy faith.

'We are not afraid,' as Mr Ewing has well observed, 'that the simple rule of Scripture will suffer upon a 'fair comparison with human inventions, even in the

'eyes of mankind *. But if it should, we dare not de-
'part from Scripture, to please men; nor shall their
'sneers dismay us, while we have Scripture on our
'side. "It is written, I will destroy the wisdom of
'the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding
'of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the
'scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not
'God made foolish the wisdom of this world? Ye see
'your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men
'after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble *call*
'*you*. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the
'world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the
'weak things of the world to confound the things which
'are mighty, and base things of the world, and things
'which are despised, hath God chosen, yea and things
'which are not, to bring to nought things that are; that
'no flesh should glory in his presence†."

Truths such as these, while they point to the depth of the wisdom and knowledge of God, abase the pride of the wisdom of man. The Bible is discovered to be a

* In a note at this place Mr Ewing says, 'Compare Matthew
'xviii. 15. 20. with all the synodical decrees, ecumenical decisions,
'canon laws, papal bulls, episcopal mandates, and pastoral admo-
'nitions which have been enacted, ordained, or issued since the
'days of the apostles.'—Good, very good, go on—and with all the stamped bonds, church covenants and printed regulations which have been extended, prepared and foisted into the churches.

Here let candour decide between Mr Ewing and me. Does not consistency demand that the three last articles should be added to his scale? Shall either party-spirit or worldly interest so far blind our minds as to induce us to condemn and expose Roman catholics, episcopalians and presbyterians, and at the same time to conceal or to spare the *popery* of independents? Either let us follow out the principles which we adopt, or abandon them altogether.

† Animadversions on Mr Robertson, p. 35.

plain intelligible book, which contains a revelation not to the learned to be interpreted by them, but level to the capacity of the whole of mankind. Christians are admonished to revert to the word of God, while they discard the cumbrous, perplexing and contradictory systems and glosses of men. And thus, after every plan of human devising to collect them has failed, after, through a partial increase of knowledge, their divisions have greatly increased, appealing in good earnest to the Scriptures alone, and ceasing to view them through the dark mediums by which they have been only obscured, believers will at length be brought together in the full acknowledgment of the truth, the only ground on which they will finally unite.

Printed by J. Ritchie.

FACTS AND DOCUMENTS

RESPECTING THE

CONNECTIONS

WHICH HAVE SUBSISTED BETWEEN

ROBERT HALDANE, ESQ.

AND

GREVILLE EWING,

LAID BEFORE THE PUBLIC, IN CONSEQUENCE OF

Letters which the Former has addressed to the Latter,

RESPECTING THE

Tabernacle at Glasgow.

BY GREVILLE EWING.

GLASGOW:
Printed by James Hedderwick & Co.
FOR M. OGLE, WILSON-STREET, AND J. AND A. DUNCAN, GLASGOW;
J. OGLE, EDINBURGH; E. LESLIE, DUNDEE; AND R. OGLE,
AND WILLIAMS AND SMITH, LONDON.
1809.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
INTRODUCTION,	3
Commencement of my Acquaintance with Mr. Haldane,	5
Proposed Mission to India,	6
Scheme of the Tabernacles,	8
Scheme of the Education of Students for the Ministry,	9
Our avowed Principles on Church Government in October 1798, ascertained by a Review in the Missionary Magazine,	11
Manner of my leaving the Church of Scotland, and my Charge in Lady Glenorchy's Chapel,	16
My Reasons for leaving the Church of Scotland,	21
Deed executed between Mr. Haldane and me,	21
Purpose for which the House was vested in me,	24
Visit to Glasgow with Mr. Haldane and Mr. Garie,	27
Change of Plan as to the Teacher of the Students—Testimony of Mr. Garie and Mr. Aikman,	27
Terms on which I taught the Students,	28
My removal from Edinburgh to Glasgow,	29
First ground of Jealousy between Mr. Haldane and me —his Attempt to induce a few Gentlemen to buy the House,	30
Documents on this Subject.	
Letter from Mr. Haldane to me, March 4th, 1800,	32
Letter from Mr. Haldane to me, March 20th, 1800,	36
Regulations, Scheme, and Proposals, respecting the attempted Sale of the House,	37
Letter from Mr. Haldane to me, April 24th, 1800,	41
First and only Attempt to carry into Effect our Plan of Co-operation,	42
Letter from Mr. Haldane to me, May 20th, 1800,	42

Page.

Letter from me to Mr. Haldane, June 4th, 1800, - 45
Letter from Mr. Haldane to me, June 7th, 1800, - 52
Conversation with Mr. Haldane at Edinburgh, in the presence of Friends, and Reconciliation, - - 59
Letter written 8th July, 1800, in consequence of the above Conversation, with Mr. Haldane's knowledge and consent, in the faith of which, the Church was formed in a House belonging to him, - - 60
Regulations of the Church, - - - - - 64
Documents respecting my Assistants, - - - 66
Disputes about the teaching of the Class, - - 68
Letter on this Subject from Mr. Haldane to me, January 24th, 1800, - - - - - 69
Situation of the Students in regard to Support, - 70
Reasons for declining to teach more Classes—Paper on this Subject, written by me in December, 1800, 71
Letter on this Subject from me to Mr. Haldane, 5th January, 1801, - - - - 77
Mr. Haldane's Accusation, that I had not done Justice to the Classes, made March, 1803, - - 79
This Accusation, acknowledged by Mr. Haldane to be unjust, October 16th, 1804, - - - 80
Conversation with Mr. Haldane on this Subject, and on the Writings of Glas and Sandeman, - - 81
Commencement of the Change of Mr. Haldane's Views on Church-Government, - - - 82
Change of my Views, as to Preparation for the Ministry, and the Persons to whom the Management of it ought to be committed, - - - 83

Documents on this subject.

Memorial concerning a Theological Academy, - 83
Letter from Mr. Haldane to me, January 26th, 1804, } 86
Letter from Mr. Haldane to me, February 16th, 1804, }
Letter from me to Mr. Haldane, - - - 90
Letter from Mr. Haldane to me, March 3d, 1804, 91
My Notes on the Manuscript of Mr. J. Haldane's View of Social Worship, similar to the Principles in the Review, October, 1798—and to those in my late Statement, - - - - - - 92
Mr. Haldane's undue Influence over the Missionary Magazine, - - - - - 92
Mr. Haldane's clandestine Endeavours to change the Principles of the Students on Church Government, 93

Page.

Publication of the Treatise on the Elder's Office—and of my Statement on disputed Points, - - 96
Previous Conversation on those Points with Mr. Haldane, - - - - 97
My preaching to the Church at Edinburgh in Bernard's Room, - - - - 98
Measures of the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home, and Distress of the Preachers and Churches connected with them, - - - 100
My Letter of Demission sent to the Clerk of that Society, - - - - 102
Notes between Mr. Haldane and me, while I was at Edinburgh preaching to the Church in Bernard's Room, - - - - 104
Case of Mr. M'Gill, - - - - 107
Letters respecting this Case, and respecting my Demission from the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home, - - - - 109
Mr. Haldane's demand of the Tabernacle, - 121
My Reasons for turning away from him, - - 123
His unfounded Charge, that I have departed from the System on which he and I set out, - - 124
My change of Mind on the Subject of Exhortation, no departure from our original System, - - 126
Mr. Haldane's ambiguous way of referring to that System, - - - - 130
Extraordinary Revolution in his Sentiments, - 133
His change of Principle on Baptism, - - 135
His change of Mind respecting the whole Character of the Church to which he and I originally belonged, 136
His real Grievance, not that I have changed, but that I have refused to change, - - - 138
My Reasons for taking the Opinion of Counsel on the Tack of the Tabernacle, - - - 138
Memorial for the Opinion of Counsel, - - 139
Answers to the Memorial, - - - 141
Remarks on Mr. Haldane's Letter of 13th June, 1808, 141
Mr. Innes's Letter to me, on hearing of Mr. Haldane's demand, - - - - 142
My Reasons for not answering Mr. Haldane's Letters, 143
Mr. Haldane's private Circulation of his Letters—and subsequent Publication of them—his unfair Dealing in both Cases, - - - - 144
Remarks on Mr. Haldane's Letter of July 29th, 1808, 145

Page.

Facts showing that he has none of the Scruples of Conscience which he alleges in the Business, - 145
Reply to his Plea, that the Manner in which he put the Tabernacle into my hands, was unwise, - - - - 147
that I left the Established Church with the view of obtaining this Possession, 147
that this might be my Reason for leaving the Established Church, - 148
that it was an Accommodation to me, 149
that the unreserved and unqualified Manner of putting it into my hands was unlawful on Christian Principles, 150
that the Conditions were unlawful, 152
that the Stamped Bond was unlawful, 154
that my Salary is levied in a way contrary to the Christian Law, - 159
that the way in which an Assistant Minister is appointed amounts to Patronage, - - - - 164
that the Bond has introduced an Evil respecting my Assistants, - 165
that the Church are under a strong Temptation implicitly to submit to me, - - - - 169
that the Church assists in building other Places of Worship, without providing for itself, - - 170
that he is asked to allow the Expence of Repairs, and to make up the shortcoming of the Assistants' Salary, 170
that the Monthly Collections are contrary to the Bond—that an Assistant Minister, as it provides, does not suit my Ideas—and that all the Collections (except occasional ones) are to be accounted for to him, - - - 171
that I have proposed a change in the Mode of educating our Preachers, 174
that he has not been distressing the Churches, - - - - 177
that the Tabernacle is operating powerfully against the Kingdom of the Redeemer, - - - - 180

Page.

that I have already obtained from it every reasonable Advantage, - 181
that I confessed the Rottenness of the whole Scheme, - - 182
that I am not on speaking Terms with some reputed Christians, - 182
that I was the first to break up the Plan of Co-operation—Misrepresentation of the Story about Mr. Bogue, 183
Remarks on Mr. Haldane's Letter of August 12th, 1808, 184
Reply to his Plea, that in a religious Connection, every thing ought to be free, - - 184
that I quashed the Plan of choosing Mr. Wardlaw as my Co-pastor, - 184
that my Paper on Vows is inconsistent with the Transaction about the Tabernacle, - - - 185
that I proposed breaking Connection long before, if Others would have agreed to it—Mr. Aikman's Testimony, - - - 187
Proposal to buy the Tabernacle, deducting the Value of the Tack—Mr. Harley's Letter on the Subject, 189
Remarks on Mr. Haldane's Letter of August 27th, 1808, - - - - 190
Reply to his Plea, that Mr. Harley had improperly termed my Tenure of the Tabernacle a Lease, 190
that he is willing to allow Time to provide ourselves in a House, on Terms to be arranged, - - 191
that my Book on Church Government, is written with Levity, Asperity, and Personality, - - - 192
that I have not adhered to Fact, in stating our Temptation for hurrying the Preparation of Preachers, - 194
that (in the Chasm of this Letter) I used means to influence English Students, similar to his clandestine Measures with Students at Edinburgh, - 195
that I did not propose to consult the Churches while the Classes were under my Care, - - 197

Page.

that my ascribing many of the Opinions which he holds, to the love of Change, is the same Charge brought against us, when I left the Church of Scotland, - - - - 197

that I used to speak of the Ministers, with whom I formerly associated, with Ridicule and Censure, - 197

that I opposed ecclesiastical Titles, and then accepted them under another Form, - - - - 198

that I preached much on Church-Order, and against the Church of Scotland, 198

Mr. Haldane's Letter to Mr. Harley, of September 9th, 1808, with Notes, - - - - - 200

Mr. Haldane's Letter to Mr. Harley, of September 22d, 1808, - - - - - - 209

Remarks on this Letter—his Offer to be satisfied with Money—to accept of it as Hush-Money—his Boast that the Tabernacle at Glasgow is now the only House held as in the Bond, - - - 210

My refusal to admit of further Overtures about purchasing the Tabernacle, - - - - - 212

Remarks on Mr. Haldane's Note of October 10th, 1808—his pretence that his Request of a Meeting alone now, was made on a new Ground, - - - 212

Remarks on Mr. Haldane's Letter of November 7th, 1808—his Commentary on Matth. xviii. 15—17, 213

—his Opinion that I have been deficient in Meekness, - - - - - - 215

Remarks on Mr. Haldane's Letter of Nov. 15th, 1808—the Chasm in it, privately circulated, about the Insufficiency of the House, - - - - 216

My Letter to Mr. Harley on this Subject, - - 218

Mr. Harley's Answer, - - - - - - 219

My Application, on this Subject, to the Dean of Guild Court, and its Consequences, - - - 220

Mr. Haldane's Wish to warn Others against following his Example, - - - - - 221

Mr. Haldane's declared Intention to apply the Price of the Tabernacle, in translating and multiplying Copies of the Scriptures, - - - - 222

The last Correspondence between Mr. Haldane and Mr. Harley, - - - - - 224

Page.

The Accompts, - - - - 226
Reply to the Charge, that I had advanced as a Fact what was known *not* to have been done, 247
that I have made a remarkable Confession, in saying that my Doctrines were modified by Feelings of previous Stipulation, - - 248
that I conceal or spare the *Popery* of Independents, - - - 249
Remarks on Mr. Haldane's Work, - - 250
Conclusion, - - - - - 251
*** Mr. Orme's Letter, - - - Appendix.

ERRATUM.

Page 246, In adding the sums, omit 0*l.* 15*s.* 4½*d.* the balance of 1806, as it was brought over and included in that of 1807, as per accompt, page 241. The sum total will then be 380*l.* 7*s.* 0½*d.*

INTRODUCTION.

I HOPE no one will suppose, that my object in publishing the following pages, is to engage in a struggle with Mr. Haldane, for the possession of the Tabernacle at Glasgow. My opinion of his demand that I should resign it, is indeed fully decided. But whether I should, therefore, resist that demand, or "rather take wrong," is a question, which I am willing that others should help me to determine. To enable them the better to judge of the case, I beg leave to bring forward certain facts and documents, which appear to me, to throw some light on it.

In forming an opinion, I request that my "temporal "concerns," to which Mr. Haldane has alluded, may be entirely laid out of view. I claim not commiseration, but justice, which is affected by no condition of life; nor would I consent, in present circumstances, to any decision, which should rest on a different principle.

Mr. Haldane professes satisfaction at the thought, that the publication of his Letters to me, "will lead to a very full "discussion of what has been doing among those with "whom he has been connected for the last ten years." His expectation may perhaps be realized. If he supposes, however, that I shall feel obliged to defend, as often as he may think proper to attack me, he deceives himself. He has compelled me to write just now; and, since I must do it, I shall give a pretty full account of my intercourse with him, from first to last. But he shall not easily prevail with me, to trouble the public again, about any thing, which may be alleged against me by him. If he shall point out any

material circumstance, which I have mistated (an oversight possible in a long detail), I shall cheerfully acknowledge the justice of the correction. But so long as I decline answering, I request my silence may be understood to signify, that I deny his assertions, or conceive them to be inapplicable, or unimportant; that I feel the evidence I have produced to be unshaken, and that, without desiring to be heard further, I leave all the reasoning, which may have been used, to its own weight. If I should even think fit to resign the Tabernacle, I give notice beforehand, that such a step will be no acknowledgement, on my part, that I have been confuted by Mr. Haldane, unless I shall explicitly make the confession. The validity of a right, and the determination of those concerned, as to maintaining, or relinquishing it, will ever be distinguished by the judicious and candid.

While Mr. Haldane repeatedly says, that "he is not "finding fault with the past," and that it is not his object to do so, he goes back to the very earliest period of our acquaintance for matter of accusation. It will, therefore, be necessary to commence my narrative at the same period.

FACTS AND DOCUMENTS, &c.

IN the year 1795, soon after the death of my first wife, having gone to Stirling on a visit to my brother-in-law, Mr. Innes, I was induced by him to accept of an invitation from Mr. Haldane of Airthrey, and accompanied him to that gentleman's place in the neighbourhood, where I was introduced to his acquaintance. My inducement to accept of this invitation, was the character which Mr. Innes (I believe in the integrity of his heart) gave me of Mr. Haldane. I was assured that he was a man of very superior talents and information, much given to inquiry, and though not decidedly serious, yet in a promising state of mind, being desirous of religious conversation, and remarkably candid and open to conviction.

After spending a day very pleasantly at Airthrey, I heard from time to time of Mr. Haldane's increasing regard to spiritual things. These reports appeared to me to be confirmed by his behaviour, during a visit which he made to his brother for a few days at Edinburgh, in the course of which we had several interviews. From my own observation, and from the united testimony of many respected friends, who had better opportunities of observation than I had, I was now led to consider him as a genuine convert to the faith of Christ. Unfavourable reports both of his temper and principles had also reached me; but these, I was assured, originated entirely in the unguarded conduct of his former life, which he had now happily abandoned, and were much exaggerated by resentment at his politics, although from these also, it was said, he was now greatly weaned.

My mind being thus favourably disposed towards Mr. Haldane, one evening, as I was sitting alone in my house in Rose-Court, Edinburgh, I was surprised by a visit from him and Mr. Innes. On inquiring when they had come to town, they informed me that they had just arrived, and that the sole object of their journey was to see me. Amidst the astonishment excited by this declaration, Mr. Innes, who had been requested to make the proposal, proceeded to state, that Mr. Haldane had conceived a plan of establishing a mission in India; that he wished for the co-operation of a few friends in the undertaking; that Mr. Bogue of Gosport and himself had already consented; that they had agreed to propose the scheme to me also; that my consent would make up a sufficient number of primary associates; and that if I thought proper to give it, Mr. Haldane would sell the estate of Airthrey, and devote the price of it to defray the expense of the mission, as well as his own life, to assist in its operations. The scheme was noble. To a mind, warmed as mine was, by missionary zeal, it would have seemed sacrilege to have stood for a moment in the way of its execution. I consented immediately; immediately was my consent accepted; and thus originated my first connection with Mr. Haldane.

Often have my friends charged me with rashness in so suddenly forming a connection of so important a nature. To this charge I am willing to plead guilty. Unquestionably I was guilty of imprudence in the extreme. All that I can say is, I was a young man, and I acted in the integrity, or at least, in the simplicity, of my heart. Some have not failed to allege, as an apology for my imprudence, that I was artfully taken by surprise. If this was the case, I certainly did not perceive it at the time, nor did I suffer myself to imagine it possible, till long after, when jealousy was excited by other considerations. I mean no reflection whatever on Mr. Bogue or Mr. Innes, for I am well persuaded that the management of the business was the exclusive work of Mr. Haldane. Perhaps it would also be injustice to him, if I should positively accuse him of artifice in this matter. I confess, however, that when unpleasant feelings have been occasioned, by unseemly appearances of artifice in other matters, painful suspicions have forced themselves upon me, and I have felt it unaccountable, on any of the ordinary principles of fair-dealing, that the other associates should have had time to deliberate, but that the whole scheme

should have been concealed from me, till it was completed, and that my consent should have been asked and accepted, at the very first proposal of the scheme, without giving me opportunity to recollect myself, or to consult other friends. In his Address to the Public, concerning Political Opinions, and Plans lately adopted to promote Religion in Scotland, page 14 of the first edition, Mr. Haldane says, that it was "after considering the matter deliberately for about six "months," that he proposed the scheme to Mr. Innes. "He and I (he adds) maturely weighed the business for six "or eight months more, to the best of my recollection, when "we invited some others to join us." I have every reason to believe, that Mr. Bogue was dealt with in a similar manner as Mr. Innes was. I must say, therefore, that if the case had been mine; if I had formed any scheme of such magnitude in so deliberate a manner, for which I wanted associates, I think I should have felt it my duty, to come upon no man suddenly, to take no man by surprise, and, instead of grasping at an immediate consent, to have guarded my friends against the impulse of the moment, and insisted on their taking time for consideration.

Mr. Haldane says, (Letters, page 41,) "You engaged in "a mission to India, and before it was prevented from "another quarter, you abandoned the design." I did not abandon the design, till after the India Company had refused us permission to go, and after all our endeavours to induce them to alter their resolution, appeared to me to be vain. The reader will easily perceive, by Mr. Haldane's subsequent conduct towards me, that I had forfeited no part of his confidence, and that, of course, he had nothing to charge me with on this occasion. His motive for the assertion which he makes now, may be judged of, from this circumstance, that he never made it to me before.

Much reason have I to bless God, that we were not permitted to go to India. What I have suffered from my connections with Mr. Haldane, will, in some measure, appear from what is yet to be stated. How dreadfully would my sufferings have been aggravated, had they come upon me in a distant foreign country!

On the failure of the India mission, my first connection with Mr. Haldane was at an end. Our intimacy, however, continued, and we had the fullest opportunity of knowing each other's sentiments on religious subjects. Mr. Haldane

must have perceived, that the various discussions which had taken place, respecting measures for propagating the gospel, abroad and at home, had considerably weakened my attachment to the Church of Scotland, and were leading me to entertain increasing doubts respecting the propriety of national religious establishments in general. The origin of my dissatisfaction, was the exercise of a power by church-courts, over ministers and congregations, which restrained the former from preaching wherever they had an opportunity, and the latter from adopting any plan for mutual edification and comfort, about which they might be agreed among themselves, and which was not inconsistent with Scripture, nor with the peace of other congregations. Similar impressions were, about the same time, made on the mind of Mr. Innes, and, professedly, of Mr. Haldane himself. None of us had yet left the Established Church, for none of us had yet come to any positive decision; and perhaps it was not, for a while, so obvious to some of ourselves, as it was to many others, that such a step was likely to be the result of the sentiments, which we had begun to entertain.

While our minds were in this state, Mr. Haldane proposed his scheme of opening Tabernacles at Glasgow and Dundee, the account of which I shall give in his own words:* " When Mr. Hill, who had been at the opening of " the Circus, returned to England, I accompanied him; and " it was while travelling along, and revolving the advantages " which I conceived Edinburgh might derive from the Ta- " bernacle, that it occurred to me, that such houses, nearly " of the same kind, although a rotation of ministers could " not so well be kept up in them, might be equally useful " at Glasgow and Dundee. I supposed, while my brother " could supply the Circus, as the stated minister, Messrs. " Ewing and Innes, who were to have accompanied me to " Bengal, would be well calculated for the other places; and " that an interchange might now and then be made with the " houses of the same kind, which had been erected at Perth " and in Caithness; and that any others, which afterwards " should be erected upon similar plans through the country, " if they conformed to the same strict and scriptural discip- " line, might be united, as far as congregational principles " admit. I merely hinted these things to two gentlemen in " England, neither of whom seemed to approve my views. I

* Address to the Public, p. 81.

" therefore said no more about them while in the south, nor " was any one else then acquainted with them."

" When I came to Scotland, I proposed the scheme to my " brother, and to Messrs. Ewing and Innes, which met with " their approbation. One of them, some time since, opened " the Circus at Glasgow as a place of worship, which was " purchased for the purpose, and the other is about to open " another house, which is building at Dundee."

The reader is requested to observe, that, according to this account, which is a very just one, the idea of opening Tabernacles at Glasgow and Dundee, originated entirely with Mr. Haldane; and that, at a time, when he was at the distance of hundreds of miles from those, whose co-operation in the scheme he afterwards obtained:—that Mr. Haldane must have had such knowledge of the state of their minds, as led him to suppose, that they were likely to embrace the measure; that, therefore, they did not adopt new views of church government, because an offer of the Tabernacles had been made to them, but that the offer was made, in consequence of a known predisposition to adopt the new views:—that the scheme, in which their co-operation was obtained, implied, not only that each should have a house in which he might officiate himself, in his own place of residence, but that houses devoted to the same purpose, should be, at the same time, established in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Dundee; a departure from which, in any of those places, must, of course, be held a breach of engagement to ALL the parties concerned:—that the parties, in this new connection, were not the same as in the projected mission to India, but consisted of Mr. Robert Haldane, Mr. James Haldane, Mr. Innes, and me:—and that this scheme, when first proposed and agreed to, was perfectly distinct from the seminaries, which were soon after instituted by Mr. Robert Haldane, for the education of students for the ministry.

The last mentioned circumstance will be still more evident, by noticing the manner, in which Mr. Haldane himself mentions those seminaries. Immediately after the passage now quoted, he proceeds to give an account of them, and makes the transition in such a way, as to show, that he felt and acknowledged them to be a separate concern. " I shall " now, says he, advert to two seminaries lately instituted. " When in England, or before I went there with Mr. Hill, " in the year 1798, (I NOW FORGET WHICH,) I conceived " the idea of sending to England, and educating there, a

" number of pious young men for the ministry, who might " be taken, as in primitive times, and, as is still common in " England, from the various occupations of life, and chosen " for the ministry, on account of their piety, and promising " talents, but never for the latter without the former."

" I AFTERWARDS abandoned the idea of sending them to " England, finding considerable prejudices were entertained " against that part of the scheme, and they were sent to Mr. " Ewing in Edinburgh, who began to instruct them in " divinity, and in other branches of knowledge that were " thought necessary or useful. With him they still con- " tinue, not having yet finished their studies. A sufficient " number in a few months was collected to make a class. " The greatest care was taken in the selection, &c."

——" Since they began their studies, a more numerous " class has been assembled at Dundee, collected in the same " manner, and with the same care, to be one year under Mr. " Innes, and another with Mr. Ewing, two years being the " time allotted for their course of improvement, which, with " their previous advantages and knowledge of divine things, " it is to be hoped, will fit them, in some measure, to be able " ministers of the New Testament."

With a view to fasten on me the charge of fickleness, " with some appearance," as he calls it, " of success," Mr. Haldane says, Letters, p. 41, " You came to me with Mr. " Grove, on a deputation from ministers of the established " church, to persuade me not to build a Tabernacle in Edin- " burgh; and a little after, you was a chief promoter of the " plan." This " little after" was a period of several months. But if there was any thing wrong here, it ought not to have been charged on my fickleness alone; because, at that period, I was already exposed to the influence of the gentleman who now accuses me.

Before proceeding to the documents respecting my departure from the church of Scotland, which took place on the 1st of December, 1798; I think it right to produce a specimen of my avowed sentiments on the nature and duties of a scriptural church, which I published in the Missionary Magazine, on the 15th of October of the same year, that is, about the very time when Mr. Haldane made to me the proposal mentioned above, about the Tabernacles in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Dundee. It is a review, very superficial indeed, and hastily written. I produce it, not as containing my present views in every particular, nor as any support

to reasoning which I have lately used, after more mature deliberation, but as incontestable evidence of my general and well known principles on the subject, at that time, as well as since. I have only to premise further, that although no name nor signature be affixed to the article, the fact of its being written by me, was perfectly known, in the circle of my intimate friends, and by no man on earth more perfectly known, than by Mr. Haldane. Besides this Review, indeed, it is notorious to all our common associates, at that period, that there were few subjects, on which we more frequently and fully stated our opinions, both to each other, and to all around us.

" A Brief Inquiry *into the Nature, Order, Offices,*
" *and Worship, of the Christian Church, as deline-*
" *ated in the Scriptures of Truth.*—By a Society of
" Private Christians in Edinburgh.—*Edinburgh,*
" *printed by T. Maccliesh and Co. and sold at*
" *their Office, Advocate's Close, and by J. Ogle and*
" *G. Panton, Parliament-Square, Edinburgh; and*
" *P. Lyle, Dalkeith,* 68 *pages.*

" Upon this performance, we shall first of all lay before our
" readers, some remarks by a correspondent, which appear
" to us equally judicious and candid.

" *To the Editor of the Missionary Magazine.*"

" Sir,"

" It is a common, but just remark, that men are constantly
" prone to run into extremes. The present is an age of in-
" quiry. Many who formerly considered themselves bound
" to abide by the sentiments of their fathers, now use the
" liberty to which they are intitled, and, not satisfied with
" the authority of some great names, examine whether their
" opinions were well founded. So far it is well. Truth
" will never suffer by discussion; but those who are freed
" from the trammels of prejudice, should beware, lest, while
" their old systems fall before the light of truth, they build
" up others equally hurtful. These thoughts occurred to me
" upon reading a late publication, intitled, A Brief Inquiry

" into the Nature, Order, Offices, and Worship of the Chris-
" tian Church. If report says true, the authors of this work
" were formerly zealous for the traditions of their fathers,
" concerning national covenants, &c. On investigation,
" they have renounced these things, and are convinced they
" have no foundation in the word of God. So far we are
" agreed; but while they have cast off these shackles, they
" appear to have rivetted others on, by no means more
" friendly to the spread of the Gospel, or the unity of Chris-
" tians. It is not my intention to review their production,
" but simply to state some reasons, why it appears to me,
" that in respect to church-government, we are not bound
" down exactly to follow the practice of the apostles. In-
" deed, however desirable this might be, it seems impossible.
" Various offices are mentioned in the primitive churches,
" with which we are wholly unacquainted, Ephes. iv. 11.
" 1 Cor. xii. 28. Rom. xii. 6. 8. Now, let those who insist
" on our exact imitation of the order and discipline of the
" apostolic churches, inform us of the nature of the various
" offices there mentioned, that we may have the like; or in
" candour they must acknowledge, that we are not tied down
" implicitly to follow what we do not understand. It is
" begging the question to say, these were miraculous gifts
" which have now ceased, and consequently offices which
" are no longer necessary. We may allow this as to gifts of
" healings, but why should we suppose it as to governments
" and helps?

" In the publication above mentioned, their own remark
" on Presbytery deserves their serious consideration. They
" allow it is mentioned in Scripture, but candidly confess they
" know nothing about it. They proceed, ' Where Scripture is
" silent, it is presumption in men to speculate.' Speaking
" of governments, 1 Cor. xii. 28. they observe, ' If men are
" to sustain the mention of governments here, as a proof for
" a certain kind of office or power in the church, there
" would be no end of the superstructures which they might
" raise on such foundations.' To this I most heartily assent;
" only observing, that this teaches me not to be too certain
" I am in the right, and all others in the wrong, when I
" cannot even define the offices in the apostolic churches,
" which I profess to take as my model.

" There are certainly laws contained in the New Testa-
" ment for the government of the church, but they seem
" only to be great general outlines, which we may fill up as

" circumstances direct. Had the unity of Christians consisted " in perfect agreement as to externals, the model of a Chris- " tian church would have been as clearly laid down, as was " the pattern of the tabernacle, when every pin was shown " to Moses on the mount *. But the unity of Christians is " the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and not " striving about words to no profit, which only tend to " subvert the minds of men, and gratify the natural car- " nality of their dispositions. Let it ever be remembered, " the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteous- " ness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, for he that in " *these things* (viz. righteousness, &c.) serveth Christ, is " acceptable to God.

" While we are by no means inclined to dispute the sin- " cerity or piety of those who see such importance in every " point of outward order, we cannot but lament, that these " things seem so much to occupy their attention, that their " zeal to spread the blessed Gospel, is in a great measure " lost. Let those churches, whose members condemn all " others as walking disorderly, at length begin to prove, that " while they tithe, mint, and annise, and cummin, they do " not neglect the weightier matters of preaching repentance " and remission of sins to *every creature*, that sinners may be " plucked as brands from the burning.

" These hints seem the more needful, as the spirit of " inquiry which has gone abroad, will probably, ere long, " bring down some ancient superstructures, which already " begin to totter. But let the friends of Jesus pray, that " while men freely inquire for themselves, a spirit of nar- " rowness and bigotry may not tie up their hands from " using means for the salvation of their perishing brethren. " To accomplish his purposes, Satan can transform himself " into an angel of light; and he well knows, that if he can " occupy the minds of Christians with zeal for order and " church-government, it will be a more effectual bar to the " use of means for awakening sinners, than almost any " device on which he can fall. Indeed he has long triumphed " in the success of this scheme. While all due attention has " been paid to order, men have perished by thousands, which

* With these sentiments of this letter, so long ago recommended by me as " equally judicious and candid," the reader is requested to compare what I have said in my late attempted Statement of the Doctrine of Scripture, page 5, and indeed the Preface throughout.

"was thought better than that order should in any case "be dispensed with. Hitherto, attention to *Presbyterial* "order has produced these blessed effects, and now there "seems a danger of as many being sacrificed to *Independent* "*order, and the model of apostolic churches.* May the Lord "give his people more concern for immortal souls, and more "love to one another *. May Christians begin to look on, "and behave to each other, as members of the same family; "and while they follow the light given them as to church-"order, wherever they have reason to believe God has "received a man as a child and heir, let them not refuse to "join with him in worshipping their common Father, or "showing forth the death of him who hath redeemed us to "God with his own blood †.—I am yours, &c."

"That the above remarks were naturally called forth by "the work before us, will appear from a very few hints at "some of its contents. The inquirers seem more anxious "about the internal arrangement *of a church*, than about the "means of gathering in THE CHURCH-UNIVERSAL. We do "not wish to use severity of language, against persons who "appear well-meaning men. But how can we speak other-"wise, when in their inquiry, What are the ordinary and "standing office-bearers appointed by Christ in *his church?* "they endeavour to exclude the office of evangelist. We do "not say, that every society called a church must have an "evangelist, or be unchurched. This would be running "into the very nicety which we condemn. But we do say, "that to talk of that office as confined to apostolic times, is "to forget that there is room and need for planting churches "now, as well as there was then; and that if the labours of "evangelists were useful, even while apostles were on the

* Compare this, and the preceding paragraph, with my Statement, page 220.

† I have no distinct recollection of the matter at this distance of time, but, in my copy of the Missionary Magazine, in which I long ago marked the names of my correspondents, as editor, when I happened to know them, I find that I have affixed to this letter the name of Mr. James Haldane. Considering my present situation, he has no right to be surprised or offended, that I should mention this circumstance. If my memorandum be correct, and I have not the smallest doubt of its being so, this single Review will give the reader an opportunity of observing what were Mr. J. Haldane's sentiments and mine, at the commencement of our connection, and of judging for himself, if he is acquainted with our subsequent writings, against whom the charge of defeating the object of the establishment of the Tabernacles, by change of principle, should be brought, if it should be brought at all.

" field, they must be very requisite now, that those holy " men have entered into their rest. We think it the deep " sin of all churches, that they have so much overlooked the " office of evangelist.

" Another grievous blunder, in our apprehension, and " which seems to be admitted throughout as a principle, is, " (not merely that our churches must be exactly copied " from what may be called the apostolic model, or the " general result of their precepts and practice,) but that " whatever circumstance can be found to have attended one " or two of the churches, must be considered as having " belonged to all the churches then, and ought to belong to " all churches now *. Thus, because there was a plurality " of elders in the church of Ephesus, and because elders are " always spoken of in the plural, therefore, there *must* be a " plurality of elders in every church. That the primitive " churches generally had, because, from their multitude, they " needed, a plurality of elders, may be true; that all numer- " ous churches yet should have a similar plurality, may be " true also. But must this be the case *absolutely in every* " *church* †? What then shall become of the ' two or three' " met together in the name of Christ? They certainly must " either want a plurality of elders, or a plurality of private " members. To us, the dilemma seems quite immaterial, " provided they enjoy their blessed promise, the presence of " Christ."

" Under this head, too, we observe an attempt to resist " the obvious meaning of 1 Tim. v. 17. That text surely " proves, that among the elders, at least of the church where " Timothy then was, there were some who did not serve the " church in public preaching, while others did ‡.

" A whole section is next spent to prove, that we have " ground to expect that fit men may be found in *each* church " for these offices. The great argument is, that Christ hath " promised to be present with his church, and is the Head " of it, hath bestowed gifts upon it, &c. Now, all this " proves, that fit men may be expected by each church; but " that they must be expected to be found within their own " body, it does not prove. And it would need very strong

* Compare this passage with Statement, p. 11.

† Compare this passage with Statement, on the number of Office-Bearers in a church, particularly pages 74, 76, 98, 117.

‡ See statement, p. 81.

" proof, indeed, to show that the Lord of the vineyard never " meant to send men to labour in any part of it, except " where they had been stationed from the beginning *. We " shall forbear making more remarks, except as to the chap- " ter on baptism, respecting which we shall only express our " hope, that the society will not confine their deliberations " to the collection of scriptures they have made already, " and will not form their judgement upon detached and " broken passages.

" Upon the whole, we consider this inquiry as a crude " performance. We highly approve of searching the Scrip- " tures; but we think the work before us resembles more " the production of advocates for a system, than inquirers " after truth."

THE manner, in which I left the church of Scotland, and my situation in Lady Glenorchy's chapel, will appear from the following letters, and will furnish matter of comparison with the manner, in which I have been compelled to break off my intercourse with Mr. Haldane, and am now urged by him to leave my situation in the Tabernacle of Glasgow.

Copy of a Letter to the Rev. the Moderator of the Presbytery of Edinburgh.

Edinburgh, 1st December, 1798.

REV. SIR,

I BEG you will have the goodness to inform the Presbytery of Edinburgh, at their next meeting, that I think it my duty to decline being considered any longer a minister of the church of Scotland.

I do therefore hereby resign my charge as one of the ministers of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel, and request that the Presbytery may be pleased to sustain this my resignation.

I am, with respect,

REV. SIR,

Your obedient Servant,

(Signed) GREVILLE EWING.

To the Rev. the Moderator of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, to be transmitted to the Presbytery.

* See Statement, pages 122, 123, 124, 159—164.

Copy of a Letter to the Trustees of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel.

Edinburgh, 1st December, 1798.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING this day informed the Presbytery of Edinburgh, that I think it my duty to decline being considered any longer a minister of the Church of Scotland; I am of course under the necessity of resigning my charge, as one of the ministers of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel.

In taking leave, Gentlemen, I beg in the most respectful and solemn manner to assure you, that I am actuated by no feeling of dissatisfaction or resentment, against either Trustees, Minister, Members of Session, or Congregation. As far as personal considerations are concerned, I go away with deep regret, and with the strongest sense, of the very handsome and indulgent manner, in which I have all along been treated by a worthy people. I intreat, that you, gentlemen, will accept my sincere profession of the highest esteem and affection for you in particular; and that, notwithstanding our separation, you will allow me to hope for a continuance of your much valued friendship. I have further to request, that you will communicate these sentiments, in any way you judge best, to the session and congregation, and assure them that I decline the formality of preaching a farewell sermon, solely because I feel myself utterly unequal to the task.

To prevent misapprehension, I beg leave distinctly to state that my reason for thus resigning immediately, is not haste to be gone, or to cause inconvenience, but an anxious desire, not to run the risk of involving the Trustees, in any embarrassment on my account.

That the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ may ever bless the pastor and people of Lady Glenorchy's chapel, is, and, while he lives, shall not cease to be, the earnest prayer of,

GENTLEMEN,

Your much obliged,

And very humble Servant.

(Signed) GREVILLE EWING.

To the Trustees of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel, Edinburgh.

Copy of two Letters from the Trustees of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel, in answer to the above.

Edinburgh, 3d December, 1798.

REV. and DEAR SIR,

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, of the 1st current, addressed to the Trustees of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel, in which you mention, that having that day informed the Presbytery of Edinburgh, that you think it your duty to decline being considered any longer a Minister of the Church of Scotland, you are of course under the necessity of resigning your charge, as one of the Ministers of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel.

The Trustees are persuaded that this resolution has not been taken by you, but upon the most serious and mature deliberation, and are fully convinced that motives of duty and principle alone, have induced you to take such a step. I beg leave to assure you, in the name of the Trustees, that they have learned your resolution with the deepest regret and concern, and that however much they may lament the circumstances which have led you to think it your duty to resign your charge, they will ever entertain for you personally, sentiments of the highest esteem, and most sincere Christian friendship and affection.

The Trustees have communicated your letter to the members of Session, and to such of the Congregation as they have had an opportunity of conversing with, all of whom also, express much regret, that they are to be deprived of so able, worthy, and pious a pastor, whose labours amongst them, they have reason to think have hitherto been so greatly blessed.

That the God of all grace and consolation may be ever with you, and bless you in all your concerns, is the ardent prayer of the Trustees, for whom I am, with much respect,

REV. and DEAR SIR,

Your very affectionate,

And much obliged Servant,

(Signed) HORATIUS CANNAN.

Rev. Mr. Greville Ewing.

Edinburgh, 3d December, 1798.

My Dear Sir,

I am directed by the Trustees of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel, to pay you 75*l.* sterling *, which is inclosed with a receipt for the same, which please sign and return to me.

The cordiality of your friends and the testimony of their regards, I am sure, must yield you sincere pleasure.

I am with much esteem and affection,

My Dear Sir,

Your faithful friend,

(Signed) Alexander Pitcairn.

Rev. Mr. Ewing, Edinburgh.

To complete what I believe Scotch lawyers would call "the progress of writs," on this part of my subject, I shall subjoin the following extracts from the Minutes of Presbytery and General Assembly.

Copy of Extract—Sentence of the Presbytery of Edinburgh relative to Mr. Ewing's resignation.

At Edinburgh, the twenty-sixth day of December, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-eight.

Which day, the Presbytery of Edinburgh being met and constituted, ...

Inter Alia, A letter was given in and read, addressed to the Moderator, from Mr. Greville Ewing, stating, That he considered it as his duty to decline being considered any longer as a Minister of the Church of Scotland, and resigning his charge as one of the Ministers of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel. . . . . .

The Presbytery accepted Mr. Ewing's resignation, and did and hereby do, declare that the said Mr. Ewing is no longer a Minister of this Church. They also appointed the Clerk to give notice of this sentence, to the Managers of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel. Extracted from the Records of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, by

(Signed) Thomas Macknight,

Presbytery's Clerk.

* This money might well be considered as a present, for I had been fully paid at the preceding Martinmas.

This sentence being found fault with, at the meeting of Synod, it was in consequence brought before the General Assembly.

Copy of Extract—Judgement of the General Assembly anent Mr. Greville Ewing.

At Edinburgh, the twenty-ninth day of May, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-nine.

Which day the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland proceeded to hear a reference by the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, relative to the resignation of Mr. Greville Ewing, minister of Lady Glenorchy's Chapel, of his character as a minister of this church: and having deliberated upon the same, and considering that Mr. Greville Ewing's resignation of his character of a minister of this church has been accepted by the Presbytery of Edinburgh, unanimously find and declare, that Mr. Greville Ewing is no longer a minister in this church, and that he is incapable of receiving or accepting of a presentation or call to any Parish or Chapel of Ease in this church, without the special allowance of some future General Assembly: and the Assembly prohibit all the ministers of this church from employing him to preach or perform any ministerial offices for them, or from being employed by him, unless some future Assembly shall see cause to take off this prohibition. Extracted from the Records of the General Assembly, upon this and the preceding page, by

(Signed) THOMAS MACKNIGHT,
Deputy Clerk.

In a late publication it has been said, "Were Mr. Ewing "to follow out his own reasoning in many parts of his book "(referring to my Statement on disputed points), it would "lead him back to the Establishment. Thus, he says, "'Christians, equally wise and good, frequently differ con-"scientiously in opinion,' &c. This reasoning would take "him directly back to 'Babylon.' WHY DID HE LEAVE "HER?" The opinion here expressed on the tendency of my reasoning, I shall at present leave untouched. But as to the question which follows it, I remark, that I published my reasons for leaving the Establishment, as long ago as the year 1800. Being contained in a single sentence, it is easy

to repeat them. "I am a Dissenter, because I think Chris-
"tianity suffers, when civil privileges are claimed by any
"denomination of Christians, in their church capacity: I
"am, moreover, a Dissenter from the Church of Scotland,
"because I am not convinced of the divine right of Pres-
"bytery *." I conceive this declaration to be a sufficient answer to the question mentioned above. The writer of the question, and Mr. Haldane who has patronised his publication, are both perfectly acquainted with this declaration. What shall I say, then? has the latter adopted a morality, which would permit a man of my principles to remain in the Establishment? Or was it expedient to remember to forget all that he once so fully knew of my sentiments on the nature of a Gospel Church †, and to affect to consider my late Publication as a recent proof of defection? I should have willingly supposed, that he really had forgot the above declaration, as well as the paper in the Magazine to which I have referred; were it not for the evidence which the reader will find in the sequel, that he has been lately scrutinising every syllable that ever dropt from my pen.

On the 8th of July 1799, in consequence of a voluntary promise by Mr. Haldane, a deed was executed, under the direction of Mr. Haldane, and written by Mr. Haldane's man of business, of which I subjoin a copy.

"It is contracted and agreed between the parties follow-
"ing: *viz.* Robert Haldane Esq. of Airthrey heritable pro-
"prietor of the subject after mentioned, on the one part, and
"the Reverend Mr. Greville Ewing minister of the gospel
"on the other, in manner underwritten, that is to say, the
"said Robert Haldane hath set, and by these presents, under
"the special conditions and provisions after mentioned, in
"tack and assedation lets to the said Mr. Greville Ewing,
"but excluding his heirs and assignees, both voluntary and
"legal, and likewise subtenants, all and whole that tenement
"lying and situated on the west side of Jamaica-Street in the
"city of Glasgow, lately known by the name of the Circus,
"but now fitted up by the said Robert Haldane for a chapel
"or place of public worship, with free ish and entry thereto,
"and the whole privileges and pertinents of the same, to be

* Animadversions on some passages of a Pamphlet, entitled Lay-Preaching Indefensible on Scripture Principles, by Mr. John Robertson Cambuslang.—By Greville Ewing, p. 13.

† See the Review, p. 11.

" occupied and possessed by the said Mr. Greville Ewing, " as a place of public worship, and for no other use or pur- " pose whatsoever, and that from the day and date of these " presents, ay and so long as the said Mr. Greville Ewing " shall continue statedly and personally to officiate as " minister, by preaching the gospel and dispensing divine " ordinances in the said place of public worship, and no " longer; without hindrance, nevertheless, to the said Mr. " Greville Ewing to make occasional visits or journies, when " he shall think expedient: With power to him to uplift " the seat-rents in the said tenement, and the collections or " offerings bestowed at the said Chapel, from time to time " during his ministry there, and to apply the same for the " maintenance and support of himself and his family, to the " extent of two hundred pounds sterling per annum, and no " more: but providing always that no rent whatsoever shall " be exacted or taken for those seats in the said Chapel or " place of public worship, known by the name of common " seats, which are to be open and patent to all persons " choosing to sit in them at all times when divine worship is " performed: Which tack, under the provision above-men- " tioned and the other conditions herein under-written, " the said Robert Haldane hereby obliges himself, his " heirs, and successors, to warrant, to be good and effec- " tual to the said Mr. Greville Ewing, during the period " above written, at all hands and against all deadly, as law " will. For which causes, and on the other part, the said " Mr. Greville Ewing hereby binds himself and engages, when " health enables him, to officiate statedly and personally as " minister in the aforesaid Chapel, and to preach the gospel, " and to dispense divine ordinances therein from time to " time, as before mentioned, and to levy and collect by him- " self, or by others of his appointment, the seat-rents yearly, " and also the offerings given in the said Chapel, or at the " doors thereof, from time to time, when divine worship is " performed there, excepting occasional collections for par- " ticular objects; and after retaining, in the First place, the " said sum of two hundred pounds sterling yearly, for the " maintenance of himself and family: Secondly, The ground " rents or feu-duties payable to the superior of the area " on which the said Chapel is built, or any other person " entitled to receive the same, and which the said Mr. " Greville Ewing is to pay once every year, and to report " discharges thereof to the said Robert Haldane: Thirdly,

" The ordinary expenses of the house, such as, cleaning and " lighting the same, and the Beadles' or Door-keepers' salaries, " or other perquisites: And Fourthly, the necessary repairs " of the said house; then to account for, and pay over the " residue and remainder of the said seat-rents and offerings, " or collections, to the said Robert Haldane Esquire, Mr. " James Haldane his brother, Mr. William Innes, minister " of the gospel, lately in Stirling, now in Dundee, and the " said Mr. Greville Ewing himself, and the survivors, or " survivor of them, to be by them or him applied for train- " ing up and educating young men to the ministry of the " gospel in Scotland; but providing always, that if the " aforesaid seat-rents and offerings or collections, shall not " amount to the said sum of two hundred pounds sterling, " yearly, for the support of the said Mr. Greville Ewing, " besides the feu-duties or ground-rents, the ordinary " expenses and repairs, then the said Robert Haldane and " his aforesaid, shall be holden and obliged to satisfy and " pay the said feu-duties or ground-rents and repairs of the " building, and to relieve the said Greville Ewing of the " same, in so far as the said seat-rents and collections shall " fall short of, or be insufficient for paying the same. And " both parties oblige themselves, their heirs, and executors, " to implement and fulfil to each other their respective parts " of the premisses, and the party failing, to pay to the party " observing, or willing so to do, the sum of fifty pounds " sterling of penalty, besides performance and consent to the " registration hereof, in the books of Council and Session, or " any other competent record therein, to remain for preser- " vation, and that all legal execution necessary, may pass and " be directed upon a decree, to be interponed thereto in pro- " per form, and for that effect they constitute

" Their procurators. In witness whereof, the said parties " have subscribed these presents, consisting of this, and the " three preceding pages, written (on paper duly stamped " conform to law) by Henry Moncrieff, apprentice to Alex- " ander Duncan, Writer to the Signet, at Edinburgh, the " eighth day of July, one thousand seven hundred and ninety- " nine years, before these witnesses, the said Alexander " Duncan and Alexander Stevenson his clerk.

" (Signed) ROBERT HALDANE."
" GREVILLE EWING."

" (Signed) ALEX. DUNCAN, Witness."
" ALEX. STEVENSON, Witness."

About the same time, a deed of precisely the same tenor, as I have been informed, was executed between Mr. Haldane and Mr. Innes, for the Tabernacle at Dundee.

In his letters (page 24), Mr. Haldane says "The house was "vested in you for *the express and avowed purpose of giving you* "*a power over the church,* which at that time appeared to be a "desideratum in regard to pastors of independent churches." This position I flatly deny. The house was vested in me, for the express and avowed purpose of rendering me, while I chose to occupy it, independent of Mr. Haldane. How scriptural and lawful this principle was, I hope I have no occasion to urge. What he here says, at that time appeared to be a desideratum in regard to pastors of independent churches, was, indeed, a very favourite opinion of his own, on which he used afterwards to expatiate as an advantage of his scheme, and which his influence on me induced me for a while to approve. But the real, because the original principle, on which, I accepted, and Mr. Haldane professed to give, the above paper, was, that in occupying a house, at the desire of the proprietor, for a purpose, in prosecuting which, every thing, under God, must depend on my own exertions, and must require both for me, and for the church which might be connected with me, the most complete liberty of conscience; it was equitable and necessary, that I should be placed in a condition entirely independent of the will of the proprietor. Not to mention conscience, it never was in my nature to become, in religious matters, the dependent of any man. I had not, on this occasion, the smallest temptation to submit to any thing so disgraceful; for I had, at the very time, proposals made me of a far less difficult situation, at Edinburgh, and, indeed, felt it a great sacrifice to leave that place; a sacrifice which I would not have made, but for the sake of the scheme of establishing Tabernacles, not merely at Glasgow, but also at Edinburgh, and Dundee. I hope my friends at Edinburgh will excuse me for this appeal to their attachment, as they must be sensible I am making it, not out of vanity, but in my just defence. I have, indeed, the happiness to know, that to this day, many of them are in the habit of declaring the desire which they then expressed for my stay among them; and of assigning their knowledge of my choice of the Tabernacle scheme, as the only reason, why a similar desire was not afterwards expressed by greater numbers and in a more public manner. It may well be imagined, that my in-

dependence was particularly precious to me, at a time, when I had virtually withdrawn my subscription from all human standards. In the Missionary Magazine, of the very same month when this deed was executed, will be found my solemn declaration, in reply to the pastoral admonition. "I "have preached, and by the grace of God, I will preach "wherever my lot may be cast, the everlasting gospel of our "Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; referring to the infallible "standard of his word, as at once '*my authority*,' and '*my* "'*public pledge of the soundness of my faith;*' and submitting "'*the correctness of my morals*' to the testimony of those who "see and know me, and to the authority of the laws of the "land in which I live *."

If the principle, on which I accepted the above paper be wrong, then I was in the wrong for accepting it; yet I am not likely to correct the error, for I certainly would not accept of any man's invitation to occupy his house for worship, were his plans ever so extensive and promising, if I must forfeit, in doing it, the independence of my own mind. No man could more explicitly disavow such an expectation than Mr. Haldane did. No man was, at that period, a more zealous advocate for liberty of conscience. It was my knowledge of his professions on this point, and my belief of them, that led me to have any thing to do with him, in this whole affair.

In accepting the offer to occupy the house, and the paper respecting it, I did not, and do not, see any thing wrong myself. If any thing wrong has been discovered by others, let them observe, that the author of both is Mr. Haldane. He alone conceived and proposed the scheme, and the deed respecting it; and he alone superintended the drawing up of the deed. I knew nothing of tacks, contracts, bonds, or law-papers of any sort: Mr. Haldane was perfectly familiar with things of this kind; and such was my confidence in him at that time, that I do believe I would have signed any paper on his declaring it to be a proper one. The reason why a legal instrument was preferred to a private letter, was, that Mr. Haldane wished to secure his then favourite scheme, from all interference of his heirs, in the event of his death.

* Missionary Magazine, vol. 4th, p. 299.

He now moves a dispute about the name of this paper, whether it be a bond, or a tack. To such special pleading, I do not at present descend. Whatever be its name, if it has not rendered me, (for life if I please,) completely independent of the will of Mr. Haldane; IT IS NOT, WHAT IT WAS DECLARED TO ME TO BE, BY MR. HALDANE. If blame of any kind attach to it, that blame originated and remains with Mr. Haldane. What I did, in the affair, was done in the most perfect innocence and integrity, at his recommendation. If it shall prove the cause of any damage to me, or to the church and congregation with which I am connected, we have, in all reason and equity, a claim to be indemnified by Mr. Haldane. And if from any flaw, which has been, or which may be, discovered in it, or from any other pretext whatsoever, Mr. Haldane shall molest or interrupt us in the course in which we have, for so many years, been led by him to think ourselves *bona fide* entitled to proceed;—we shall be injured and deceived by Mr. Haldane.

The publication of this tack is highly satisfactory to me on one account: it will put an end to a report, which Mr. Haldane was at no pains to contradict, that I was secured by him in a salary, independent of the love of the people among whom I labour. Every reader will now see, that while the tack fixes my income, and relieves me of the burden of the ground-rent, in case the funds of the house should fall short of the sum fixed; it affords me no security for a single farthing, unless it be voluntarily given by the congregation.

I do not remember the time exactly, but I think it must have been sometime in the month of November, 1798, Mr. Haldane and I made a visit to Glasgow, accompanied by the late Mr. Garie of Perth. Mr. Haldane's journey, at this time, had two objects in view. The one was to show me the house, then called the Circus, before he should purchase it, and fit it up as a Tabernacle. It was on this account, that I went with him. The other object was, to converse with persons, who had been recommended as students, for the class, of which I have quoted above, p. 9, Mr. Haldane's own account. It was not on this account, that I went with Mr. Haldane to Glasgow, (for though engaged in the scheme of the Tabernacles, I had as yet no connection with the class, which was then to have been sent to Mr. Bogue,) but being there at any rate, and having little besides to do, I was generally, if not always with him, when he held those con-

versations, and he consulted me frequently, as to the selection of the students. Mr. Garie had, in this journey, business of his own; but he was now, in some degree, connected with us, felt a warm interest in our measures, and was much with us. It was during the few days we then stayed at Glasgow, that Mr. Haldane "abandoned the idea of "sending them (the students) to England, finding, (as he "says in the above quoted account *,) considerable preju- "dices were entertained against that part of the scheme." Of those prejudices, I certainly did speak to Mr. Haldane; but I was neither the only person, nor the first, who spoke to him on the subject. In fact, what I said to him, was occasioned by what was previously stated to us both, in every conversation with every friend whom Mr. Haldane consulted. I have no certain proof, that it was I, who prevailed with Mr. Haldane, to change his plan. On the contrary, I have the testimony of Mr. Aikman, that Mr. Garie supposed himself to be the person †. Be this as it may, I am sure none of us had the most distant idea, of advising Mr. Haldane to break his faith with Mr. Bogue, or of providing him with a precedent for violating any engagement with any man. I believe all, who, at that time, heard him state his plan, supposed it to be still open to discussion; and the very fact of his consenting to change it, on account of what he knew, as well as we, to be the prevailing prejudice, was to us the most satisfactory proof, that no engagement stood in his way.

When Mr. Haldane yielded to the prejudice against sending the class to England, he proposed that it should be sent to me. With the prospect of so laborious a charge, as that

* Page 9.

† Mr. Aikman has lately confirmed his testimony in the following words: "Respecting the fact to which I have alluded, you will probably recollect "that I mentioned to you, that the late Mr. Garie, a man incapable of false- "hood, informed me, that he was the man who remonstrated with Mr. Hal- "dane against sending the class to Mr. Bogue, and he it was (he assured me), "who suggested you as a fit person to undertake the charge. There is no "person who knows you, who will not be sensible, that what is there laid to "your charge, is altogether inconsistent both with the temper of your mind, "and your uniform conduct. It is possible you may have joined Mr. Garie in "what he stated respecting the clamour then raised against Mr. Bogue, but "this I can affirm with the most perfect recollection of the conversation, that "Mr. Garie took the credit of suggesting the plan wholly to himself. And I "cannot help regarding the communication at that time made to me, as hav- "ing been very providential for the vindication of your character."

of the Tabernacle, it may well be imagined, that no man could be very easy at the thought of so great an additional burden. Mr. Haldane was pleased to say, that, unless I would undertake it, the class must go to England; and my consent was given, entirely on the ground of its being the only way of avoiding a measure, which, we all saw, was generally thought inexpedient.

As the proposal of sending the class to me, originated entirely with Mr. Haldane, so did the terms on which I was to teach them. He said he would give me 10*l.* per annum for each student, on condition that I should furnish each with grammars in English, Geography, Greek, and Hebrew*, which should become the students' property, and be carried away by them; and should collect and maintain such a library, as might employ them usefully in reading during the course of their studies. On these terms, the number to be taught was twenty. I was to provide a class-room for them, while they and I remained in Edinburgh, which was to be till the following Whitsunday. After that we were to meet in the vestry of the Tabernacle, which was to be fitted up for the purpose.

All our agreements respecting the classes were merely of a verbal nature; and the history of them will, perhaps, enable the reader to judge, with more advantage, between the merits of a verbal, and a written agreement. For my own part, it is long since I had occasion to tell Mr. Haldane, that if I had not had our agreement about the Tabernacle in writing, I should soon have had as little to do with it, as with the classes. The terms, which I have mentioned, were very liberal, and I was fully disposed to act with corresponding liberality in the purchase of books. They were never acted upon. Instead of twenty students, Mr. Haldane informed me, that four and twenty were thought fit for admission; but hinted that he did not choose, for the sake of four, to increase the expense of educating the class. I said, that need be no obstacle to their admission, as I would cheerfully do to them as to the rest, without any additional remuneration. Mr. Haldane took that opportunity of proposing new terms. I was now to receive 200*l.* a-year, whatever might be

* The books which I presented to each student, were, Scott's Pronouncing Dictionary, Barry's Collection, Guthrie's Geographical Grammar, Wilson's Hebrew Grammar, and my Greek Grammar and Lexicon which I wrote, and, at my own expense, printed, for the purpose.

the number of students, and to provide them with grammars, and give them the use of a library as before. I consented without the smallest scruple, and on this footing I taught the first class, consisting of twenty-four. The second class was sent for one year, to Mr. Innes, and, I think, I did not furnish them with English and Geographical Grammars; but their number was double that of the first class, and these I supplied with Greek and Hebrew Grammars. Only two classes were expressly agreed on, but Mr. Haldane often said, that although he would not engage for it, yet he saw no reason why I should not expect to continue in the employment. Before I was done with the first class, I had various reasons to be dissatisfied with the employment, and to decline continuing in it, at any rate. I could not but observe, however, that no less than three changes, all of the same description, were proposed in the terms, and, on a ground, as will afterwards be stated, of a very improper kind. My refusal to go on in the business, prevented opportunity; otherwise, from what I saw, I have every reason to believe, that I might soon have said, as Jacob did to Laban, " thou " hast changed my wages ten times."

At Whitsunday 1799, I removed from Edinburgh to Glasgow. Hitherto Mr. Haldane had behaved to me with the utmost appearance of cordiality and respect. When in any instance he acted otherwise, he showed himself eager to make an apology, and to correct what was wrong. On my coming to Glasgow, a new scene began to open. I soon found myself involved with a gentleman, who could easily change from the most insinuating to the most repulsive manners, from the highest professions of confidence to the lowest suspicions of jealousy; who must ever interfere, but never be contradicted; who being pleased with no plan after it was once set a-going, was always insisting on some alteration; and who had the strangest propensity, I had ever seen, to endeavour to argue people out of their senses and memory, in order to persuade them, that previous agreements were entirely consistent with every new idea, however opposite, which had since occurred to him.

With all the labour and difficulty of preaching in a new place, and teaching young men who were studying for the ministry, there came upon me daily the vexatious and endless task of maintaining *discussions* with Mr. Haldane. When he was with me or I with him, the day, and part of the

night, must be occupied in discussion; and when separate, few weeks passed, in which besides preparing for the class and the pulpit, I had not to prepare what to me was most wearing out and distressing, a letter of discussion, generally on some unpleasant subject, in reply to voluminous letters from Mr. Haldane.

In his letters, page 48, Mr. Haldane says, "The first unhappy introduction of jealousy between us, was the unscriptural transaction of the bond." This representation is far from correct. The first introduction of jealousy between us, was an attempt which Mr. Haldane made, and repeated several times, to induce a few gentlemen, who had taken a particular interest in the success of the Tabernacle, to buy the house, advancing a considerable sum at their own risk, and binding themselves to adhere to a plan to be given them by Mr. Haldane. This is alluded to by him, at page 75, where he says, "To them I stated, immediately after Mr. Ewing "went to Glasgow, that I thought it would be the duty of "the Church which should assemble in that house, as soon "as possible, to pay interest for the price of it, and to "clear the debt, and make it their own, which I observed, "they ought to endeavour to do in the course of ten years." Mr. Haldane is very right in saying, that he stated this *after* I went to Glasgow. *Before* that period, he never uttered a syllable to such a purpose. When he saw the crowds and the collections, he thought he might recover his money; and though he lowered his demands, when he found they were resisted, and at last refused to depart from our original contract, he seems ever since to have had a grudge against me, because I would not solicit the Church to purchase his property. He justly observes, that "very few, excepting "three or four individuals, have known any thing particular "about this matter." An explanation of it will greatly assist in judging of the present dispute between us.

When I consented to open the Tabernacle, I had no idea of a house being devoted to the worship of God, and afterwards claimed as private property. The personal agreement with me, I understood to be merely a previous step, to be followed up (if the undertaking succeeded) by a Trust Deed, securing to the Church or Congregation which should worship there, the use of that house for the purposes to which it was devoted, without exposing the trustees to any pecuniary loss whatever.

Mr. Haldane afterwards declared, that he never intended this; but I must ever assert, that the whole tendency of our original conversations on the subject, was to make me believe that this was his intention. Besides, as the intention which he afterwards avowed, was singular, it was the more necessary that he should have been explicit in stating it from the first; which most certainly he never did, and did not even hint at it, till after I had been preaching in the Tabernacle at Glasgow for some time. It was not, indeed, till the gentlemen, who had hitherto taken the chief trouble about the affairs of the house, thought it right to inquire what were his intentions concerning it, before a church should be formed, that I discovered what those intentions were. The kind of bargain which Mr. Haldane at that time proposed to make, and especially the manner in which he conducted the discussions on it, made an impression on the gentlemen concerned, which, I believe, they were never able afterwards to efface. Some notion of the bargain, and of the impression made by it on my mind, may be obtained by perusing the following documents, which are the whole I possess on the subject. I shall only premise, that this misunderstanding was the cause of my declining for a considerable time, being concerned in the formation of the church, and, indeed, doubting whether one ought to be formed at all. I consented to it at last, rather as a measure which could not now be avoided, than as one which I directly approved. I can never say, that I regret that a Church was formed in Glasgow, (for I have been blessed with a degree of success and comfort there, far beyond my expectation,) but I certainly do regret the formation of a Church in a house belonging to Mr. Haldane. I would never have been concerned in it, had I not been previously led into a situation, which was not explained to me, till I could not with propriety withdraw from it; and if I had escaped that snare, I should never have experienced the injurious treatment, by which I am at present harrassed *.

* In page 52, Mr. Haldane says, "I wrote many letters to Mr. Ewing." —Again, "I always wrote to him in confidence, and as to a friend."—After the flagrant breaches of confidence, of which Mr. Haldane has been guilty, in publishing and perverting many things, which happened, in the intimacy of private friendship, several years ago, and which he never before alleged as ground of complaint; I believe few would be surprised if I should publish every letter of his, which I have in my possession. It will be found, however, that I produce nothing, which his own attacks have not rendered necessary for my vindication.

Copy of a Letter from Mr. Haldane to me.

Edinburgh, March 4th, 1800.

My Dear Sir,

I received your letter of the 28th, and would have answered it sooner, had I not been much engaged.

I have maturely weighed the business you wrote upon, and after much consideration, and I can also add, much prayer, it appears to me to be my duty to keep the disposal of the house in Glasgow, after your incumbency, in my own hands, unless reimbursed in the expence I have been at upon it; at least to the extent I have already mentioned.

Let not this be considered a change of opinion on the subject, far less as drawing back from what I agreed to. You know from the first *, the same was decidedly my intention respecting all these houses, and upon this plan the agreement I entered into with you was formed; and even those plans which the other gentlemen and I discussed, had the same for their basis. As to drawing back, if any thing like this appear to have taken place, I have only to remind them and you, that I always said I would come to no fixed resolution upon a subject of such consequence, till after I had returned to Edinburgh, had seen the whole distinctly drawn out, and considered it for some time; and the same I must still say, till every thing is finally adjusted and settled. From Mr. Harley's letter too, I understood all idea of the business going on according to my propositions was nearly if not wholly given up; and he added, not as the reason of this, but as a corroborating circumstance, that provision for the poor had been forgot; his letter I received several weeks ago.

What I now propose to you is, that either I will give up the house altogether for one thousand pounds less than it cost me; or, that in the first place giving up seven hundred pounds, all the surplus produce of the house, after defraying certain expences, to be specified, shall be paid to me annually, and the amount of it above the interest due on the remaining sum shall go yearly, during your incumbency, to pay off the debt.

* This I solemnly deny. From the first, I was led to believe, that all these houses were devoted, as Lady Glenorchy's Chapel at Edinburgh was, to the free use of a Christian congregation in the worship of God. The reference in the postscript of this letter, to a report which he had heard respecting Lady Glenorchy's conduct, as to her chapels in England, shows, that we had been, at that time, in the habit of appealing to her as an example.

From the period of your departure, the managers shall retain the house one year, (as you proposed,) for the use of the church-members, the surplus of that year being applied as before, and during the first six months of the said year, they shall determine whether they can retain the house or not; and if they are able they shall get it upon this condition, that they either pay me or my heirs the money that shall remain due, I then giving up the rights of the house to be managed by them as formerly intended, or, that they give me sufficient security, independent of the subject, that the money shall be paid within five years from your leaving them. Should they not be able to do either of these, the house, at the end of the twelvemonth, to revert wholly to me, and if any money shall remain in my hands of the surplus paid to me over and above interest for the *whole* of my advance, that sum shall be repaid by me or my heirs to the managers, to provide another place of worship for the church.

The above plan is simple, and the advantages to those who wish to join in such church-fellowship as you propose, are, in my opinion, obvious. They will thus be collected together, insured of a large house, while their first minister remains with them, and, from its size, during that time will have the pecuniary assistance of the numbers that attend. Besides, nothing more than the surplus of their necessary expences being yearly paid, the debt may gradually be cleared off without much exertion. They will also have from the first, the large deduction from the price of 700*l.* and a subject which would be sufficient security, even at present, for the remaining sum; the debt being only about 2000*l.* with the feu upon ground, and a house which cost 1300*l.* before the house was harled, floored, windows put into it, plastered, or fitted up with the wood of galleries, and seats, which is considerable: which articles, taken together, and counting them at half the price they cost, I suppose, do meliorate the property the remaining sum; besides all which, there is a prospect in a year or two of a street being carried through in front, and which would, of course, add to the value of the subject. On the other hand, if the worst happens, and if, after your incumbency, they must leave the house, then they only pay interest of the money laid out as rent, while they possess, which being but 5 per cent instead of $7\frac{1}{2}$ is surely very moderate, being $2\frac{1}{2}$ below the usual interest for building. They have also a whole year to provide another house, with the advantage of any money that may be over the interest,

which had been raised yearly in the gradual manner of seat-rents and collections.

I consider it my duty then, to keep things on this footing, because, as appears to me, my object will thus be most surely obtained. If the money be repaid me, it greatly increases my power of assisting other places. If it is not, and I survive your incumbency, I can then follow out my present object by placing another man there, able (as my firm persuasion is that you are) not only to direct and edify a church, but to arrest the attention of the careless multitude, and to preach the gospel to the body of the people, in a striking and useful way. This last, you know, was all along my object, in building these Tabernacles, and by the means I propose, I consider it as most likely to be obtained, while, if I were to put the house out of my own power, I do not know but that the church who shall assemble there may get into a narrow and contracted party spirit, and after you leave them choose a man very well calculated, it might be, to preach to a few serious people, but very unfit for exciting general attention. And even if the church should not be of such a disposition, one or more individuals might, in the case of the election of a Pastor, obtain a lead for the time, and bring in some relation or acquaintance, recommended to themselves by the partiality of friendship, while the general good was overlooked.

If either of these suppositions, which are not chimerical, should be realised, my plan would be completely defeated, and a year or two hence I might unavailingly lament my folly, in giving way to the well meant importunity of my friends, who, I believe, sincerely wish, that my plans should succeed, and that my character and conduct appear fair and generous to the public.

In these ideas I may be wrong, yet they are according to my judgement, and I can appeal to the Searcher of hearts, by whom I must soon be judged, and to whom I must account for the application of that property committed to me, that I am, in this business, actuated by no selfish motive, that I know of, either by a covetous wish for money, or a vain desire of influence and patronage.

Let it be also remembered, that in considering a proper settlement for your house, I have a particular view likewise to others.

I trust upon weighing these things, you will be satisfied either to adopt this new plan, or abide by the present one; and as soon as the other gentlemen and you wish me to go

west, I shall attend you, that every thing may be speedily settled, so as not any longer to obstruct the arrangements which you may think it proper to make.

Mr. Innes has agreed to keep his class till the 25th of November, and I hope it will be agreeable to you to lengthen your course to that time, which is the latest period I shall speak of; and I think it should be quite sufficient, being nearly two years.

Before I received your letter, I was going to write you upon another business. I am afraid you are over-exerting yourself, and that you may afterwards feel the bad effects of it. You had better take care in time. Preaching three times a-day in the Tabernacle is really too much for you. Would it not be more adviseable to give up the evening to the ablest of your students, and take the forenoon and afternoon yourself, till you get an assistant? I really wish you would do something of this sort. Your spirits must otherwise flag under labour without intermission, and you would soon wear yourself out.

I observe you are writing in your own vindication; I trust your publication will be more in your Master's spirit than your own, who, when he was reviled, threatened not, and of his apostle, who says, being defamed, we intreat. Severity of expression would not only be unbecoming the gospel, but hurtful, and, I doubt not, afterwards, painful to yourself. May you have in this the mind of Christ, and may his Spirit direct you in what is right. What a poor figure does Mr. P——'s Publication cut with all his wit. Surely his pamphlet, while it may prove a stumbling-block to the world, will not be handed down to posterity, as a useful apology either for Christianity or Christians. May the God of love be with you, support, strengthen and direct you in this matter. Desiring to be affectionately remembered to Mrs. E. I am,

My Dear Sir,

Ever yours most sincerely,

(Signed) Robert Haldane.

None of the accounts about the Tabernacle, Watt's, or the others, have yet been sent me; till they all come here, I cannot well go west.

Since writing the above, I have heard that Lady Glenorchy put none of her houses in England under trust, but kept them in her own hands.

Copy of a Letter, from Mr. Haldane to me.

Edinburgh, March 20th, 1800.

My Dear Sir,

———As to the Tabernacle, I am not sure whether I understand you in your last letter or not. You say, "All we "want is to be secured against being turned out of it, in "such an event as your death, while we pay a reasonable "consideration." As you must know that I never intended to hint, in the most distant manner, that it would be proper, under any new arrangement, that the fundamental article of our agreement, I mean your possessing the house for life, or while you officiated in it, if you chose, should in the least be infringed, so while you continue, you are perfectly secured at all events *. I rather suppose then, you meant to say, "All we want is, that the *Church* be secured, &c. &c. while *they* pay, &c.

But by my last proposal they are secured during your incumbency, although my death should happen before its expiry, and they have a year after to provide themselves, if they find it necessary to leave the house. Further than this, I really think they need not contend. If at that period, they continue flourishing, part of the debt will no doubt be paid, but should it not, they have the offer of the house at 700*l.* less than it cost, abating the interest from the very beginning of your incumbency of the said 700*l.* and have five years to pay the money. Surely then, with a very small exertion, they will be able to borrow the remaining money they may want upon the subject, which will clear them entirely of my heirs, or of any other person. Should they not be able to borrow the money over such a subject, I suspect a smaller house, at the end of the year, will be more convenient for them, especially, as all their money, except interest for the house, will be returned. As to provision for the poor, I do not know how Mr. Harley and the other gentlemen have forgot that it was *made* in our last scroll of an agreement which I showed them, where it remains, with this alteration upon the margin, from our last conference, that while before it was to be laid out by the managers and minister, after the

* Let the reader compare this sentence with Mr. Haldane's late publication, and with the account of the "fundamental article of our agreement," which I have given in pages 24, 25, 26.

debt is paid, it shall be in the usual way by the Church and Deacons. You shall see it when we meet. It was, I believe, forgot in the consideration of expences, but was never struck out of the paper I shewed, or intended, as far as I recollect, to be so. Perhaps, as the poor members only are to be assisted, the Church might make an additional private collection monthly, as they do here, and supply the deficiency from the other collection, and this would remove every difficulty. I do hope that when you all meet, after due consideration, you will not only acquiesce in my proposal, but be satisfied with it. I agree with all you say as to the necessity and propriety of forming your church. I wish you would send the copy of the hymns immediately by the coach, if it is finished. I have got Watt's accounts, but when Mr. Harley comes home, desire him to send all the others, and a note of the money he has received and paid for me.

I think your animadversions excellent, and in a proper spirit. He will not answer you. It served your argument, but I do not much like your remark upon the work at Cambuslang; it was that way the Spirit of God chose to work in many who were really converted, and "what was "I, &c." says Peter. But you have fairly and ably answered Mr. R. It is a very different answer from Mr. P.'s, and all here seem highly pleased with it. My kindest love to Mrs. E. and believe me yours most sincerely.

(Signed) R. HALDANE.

Copy of Regulations specified and written by Mr. Haldane for the Tabernacle, Glasgow.—It is not dated.

1. Agreement with Mr. Ewing holds good in his favour.
2. He shall have the choice of his assistant, who is not to receive more than 100*l.* a-year till the debt is paid.
3. That I shall have power to name the managers at any vacancy that may happen, till the debt is paid.
4. That a vacancy in the office of Pastor shall be supplied by a fair election by church-members.
5. That a Pastor shall not be elected for life, but during the pleasure of the church.
6. No seats to be sold.

7. After the debt is paid, one-third of the seats to be always free, and all in the evenings.

8. After the debt is paid, the managers to be chosen by the church.

9. The surplus of the house shall be laid out annually, after the debt is paid, for the education of young men to the ministry in Scotland, upon the congregational plan of church government.

10. Managers to direct the temporal concerns of the house, provide for the poor, &c.

11. Regular accompts to be kept by them.

12. If my brother survive, he to be exactly in my place as to the above during his life.

Copy of a Scheme written on the same paper with the above, by Mr. Haldane, and dated April 26th, 1800.

1. That I shall sell the house, to be managed, according to regulations formerly specified, for all time coming, by trustees to be named.

2. That I shall give up one thousand pounds of the price.

3. That the trustees shall pay me on or before Whitsunday, 1801—500*l.* as part of the price, for which they may burden the house after I am paid.

4. That I shall allow the remaining sum to lie upon the house.

5. That they shall annually pay me 120*l.* as interest of the above remaining sum, and the whole surplus produce of the house, should there be any, in part of the principal.

6. That if they fail to pay the above sum annually, till the whole debt is extinguished, then at the end of Mr. Ewing's incumbency, or any time afterwards when the deficiency shall happen, the house to revert wholly to me or my heirs.

7. That if this shall happen, an exact account shall then be made up of what the house cost me, and of the yearly interest of that sum till the period alluded to, and if it shall appear that I or my heirs have received more than the amount of these sums, viz. principal and interest, then the whole sum overpaid shall be refunded, first to those individuals, in equal portions according to their shares, who

may have advanced the 500*l.*—and next, if any part remains, to the managers for behoof of the church-members.

Or,

That it should be added to the plan last proposed to Mr. Ewing, that security be given that the house shall be continued a place of worship for ten years from its opening; although entirely in my power in other respects, after Mr. Ewing's incumbency—and that they shall have the choice of the above two plans.—I will not, however, bind myself to these plans until they are fully drawn out and considered; although it be *at present* my full intention to implement them, if the gentlemen concerned wish that it should be so.

This scheme was, if I mistake not, brought from Edinburgh by Mr. Harley. The following, I believe, is that which, in the above paragraph, is called "the plan last proposed to Mr. Ewing." It had been written a day after the Regulations, page 37, but before the Scheme, page 38, which had been written afterwards on the same paper with the Regulations, when sent back, as I suppose, to Edinburgh.

Copy of Proposals to Mr. Ewing.

1. That under the regulations specified in the paper yesterday given to him, I now sell the Glasgow Tabernacle for 1000*l.* less than its cost.

2. That 500*l.* of the price be paid me at Whitsunday, 1801—and interest of the whole to that period, of course.

3. That I shall allow the sum remaining of the price to lie upon the house, having the subject for my security, which sum, as far as not previously paid off, shall be paid to me, if I demand it, at the end of Mr. Ewing's incumbency, in the following manner: 500*l.* of principal within one year after that period, and 100*l.* a-year of principal from that period till the whole shall be paid off.

4. That from the beginning until that period, 100*l.* and all the surplus besides, if there shall be any, be paid to me annually, 1st, as interest, and next as part payment of the principal.

5. That if, at the above period, the remaining debt be demanded, and cannot be paid, the house shall revert to me, and I shall retain the interest due to me from the beginning for the *whole* of the money I laid out upon the house, and return all above the said interest that shall have been paid me.

6. Those lending the 500*l.* shall have security over the subject, to be repaid principal and interest after the money is paid to me, if there be any remainder, and shall in exact proportions to their shares, if the house revert to me, receive from me the surplus which I return, if there be any.

The principle I go upon is, that I will upon no account give up the house after Mr. Ewing's incumbency, without receiving what I deem an equivalent, viz. the whole cost excepting 1000*l.* and that I give this large subscription upon certain regulations, such as formerly spoken of.

N. B. That the whole house be kept as a place of worship.

Such were the schemes proposed by Mr. Haldane, *after* I had opened the Tabernacle in Glasgow. Then he, who had professed to have devoted those houses as a *Deodand*, talked of being a large subscriber to them, provided his plan was adopted, and he was paid principal and interest for the rest of their value. Then also, I, who had been led to believe that I had opened a house freely devoted to the worship of God, found, to my inexpressible mortification, that I had been used as an agent by Mr. Haldane, to prepare a part of his property for a particular market. Nor would he explicitly say what he would actually stand to; his schemes were various and confused; and both in writing, as above, and in conversation, he always reserved to himself a claim for further consideration, while he urged the gentlemen to agree to the terms which he dictated to them, and to which he insisted they should implicitly submit. As I intend to subjoin all the accounts of the Tabernacle, the reader will be able to judge what would now have been the situation of the gentlemen in question, if they had complied with the demands of Mr. Haldane; unless, indeed, instead of collecting for others, as we have done, and done cheerfully, I had, from time to time, been employed in trying to raise money on a house, which I never would have entered, but in the belief that it was free.

When the gentlemen, to whom the above plans were successively proposed, declined acceding to them, (in the propriety of which step they and I fully agreed,) I felt for a

long time, an invincible reluctance to the idea of forming a church; not only because I thought it wrong that a church should be dependent for accommodation on the mere will of any individual, but because finding myself completely disappointed as to the past, I did really begin to fear that further disappointments might still be awaiting me. My chief reason for thinking it wrong that a church should be dependent for accommodation on the will of an individual, was, that I feared it would give that individual a power similar to that of patronage. I had always understood that Mr. Haldane disapproved of such a power; but on reading a letter, of which the following is an extract, I found I was mistaken.

Edinburgh, April 24th, 1800.

——— "I am sorry that you and I differ so "much in our sentiments, respecting the Tabernacle; as I "have written you fully on that subject, I shall not again "begin it. As to patronage, however, I must say, although "especially in this country it sounds very ill, I do not think "in its abused meaning at least, it can be applied to this "case. Sometimes one may properly exercise power put "into his hands for good purposes, and in such cases, when "there is a probability of abuses, should it be given up, I "think duty would be sacrificed.

"I do not see, at any rate, why that may not be done "properly a second time, which was lawfully done once *; "or why temporary accommodation may not be afforded for "the ordinances of the gospel, although no more should be "intended. I really think you have not well considered the "footing your congregation would stand upon, were my "offer accepted.—But you, on the other hand, think I have "not considered it. Mr. Harley is here, who seems to "think nearly as I do upon the subject; and we shall con-"verse together about it. I am,

"My Dear Sir,

"Yours, very sincerely,

(Signed) "Robert Haldane."

* In the letters of Mr. H. the reader will perceive a great many instances of the *argumentum ad hominem*, in which he endeavours not to plead the real merits of the question, but to embarrass me by the situation into which himself has brought me. In this passage, he insinuates that appointing me to an empty house, was the same thing with appointing a minister to a church after it had been formed.

After many conversations and letters on the subject, I at last requested Mr. Haldane that a meeting for mutual consultation should take place, between himself, Mr. James Haldane, Mr. Innes, and me, the parties connected in opening the Tabernacles in Scotland. This was the first attempt which was ever made, so far as I know, to carry into effect the plan of our co-operation, proposed by Mr. Haldane himself. He, who now brings against me, an unfounded charge of being the first to break up this plan of co-operation, never permitted it to commence. It was largely dwelt on by Mr. Haldane, when the Tabernacles were recommended: it was uniformly resisted by him, after they were accepted. On this occasion Mr. Haldane wrote me the following letter:

Edinburgh, May 20th, 1800.

My Dear Sir,

I have been favoured with both your letters; but the one from Mr. Harley which you mention, I have not yet received.

I observe what you say of proposing a meeting with Mr. Innes and my brother, but I really cannot think of putting them or you to that trouble upon a matter that, as you know *, my mind has been long made up on, and which regards me personally much more than it does any of you. The more I think of it, the more I am satisfied that your present agreement † should stand (written, as you know, after a very full explanation made long before), giving a church temporary accommodation ‡; or that, if that church wish for more, they should purchase the house, upon very advantageous terms.

The more I think of it, the more forcibly it strikes me as unnecessary to make a present of such a house to the church which may be collected at Glasgow, which, from various circumstances, will, in all probability, more easily purchase accommodation, than either that at Perth, Aberdeen, or elsewhere. You observe, it is neither right nor

* Never does he refer more confidently to my knowledge, than when I am completely ignorant. I knew nothing of the matter till he made his recent and unexpected declaration on the subject.

† The Contract which he now wishes to set aside.

‡ "Temporary accommodation" was a phrase which, in the full explanation alluded to, had never once been used by Mr. Haldane.

possible to bring a church under pecuniary obligations for the price of the house—but recollect, that such an obligation on their part was not required It was only intended, if they chose it, that they should have an opportunity of gradually redeeming the house out of its own proceeds *, till the price was very much reduced indeed.—Your views now seem altered. You lately said you did not wish me to give it up without any price, but now you do.—However that is nothing to the purpose. The question is, what is right to be done.—I have been in one mind about this from the beginning, either to keep it in my own power, or to get some considerable part of the price, if I gave it up: in short, so much as would leave me little cause of regret, although it should be soon perverted from its destination, by enabling me to build another.—Upon these views all the plans I offered were formed.—The one I had considered in Edinburgh, Mr. Harley and you were against: the others were hastily formed as you know, at the same time with an express proviso, that they were not binding till further considered. Some of these upon being so considered, did not suit you, and others did not suit me, and I do not see that upon this account blame attaches to either party.—I do not think you should press me further upon the business, nor I urge you. Mr. Harley knows my brother's views. As the matter stands, it certainly is not difficult (in my opinion) for you to decide what you are to do; a very clear line of conduct in Providence seems before you, and no blame can attach to you for following it. You told me the four gentlemen refused to form a church in such circumstances; but are you bound to them? Why not follow your own opinion, or at least the proposal you made to form a church? It would no doubt have been more agreeable had they gone along with you, but their not doing so, should they adhere to their resolution, cannot be helped; and I doubt not you will get many good serious people who will act according to present circumstances, without harrassing themselves by taking so much thought for to-morrow, which they may never see. You seem to me at present to be in a particular situation. I think you and the Christians who attend are a church

* The 500*l.* to be advanced, could not have been obtained out of its own proceeds. It must have come out of the pockets, or the personal credit of the gentlemen in question, had they accepted the conditions. And Mr. Haldane was to have preferable security, so that all the risk fell on them.

enjoying communion in the ordinances of the word, prayer, and baptism; but neglecting the ordinance of the supper, and discipline, because you have not what I am persuaded no Christians had for the first century at least, and what the church in Edinburgh have not, who are going on in a most agreeable manner.

I really think you are harrassing yourself to little purpose about futurity.—At all events, I see nothing now that can be done till you have formed a church. As soon as you do so, and the members become anxious about securing the house, let me know, and I will go west and endeavour to settle with them about their purchasing it; if they do not become so, let the matter stand, till some future time, when the progress of events may direct us all. In the mean time, no blame can attach to you, and the church will be just as the one here is. Should your incumbency expire without any settlement, they will either then procure the present or another house. In this there cannot be more difficulty to them than to others, and why should they expect to be accommodated for nothing more than others; at least if they will be so accommodated, they must submit to some difficulties, such as uncertainty of possession, which, however, may never after all affect them.—I am persuaded after your church is formed, the business may be as easily settled as now. Indeed I cannot help thinking the demands made upon me are unreasonable, and that my offers are very advantageous to your people. No man by these ever can be brought into any pecuniary embarrassment, and if the house succeeds it will undoubtedly pay itself.

May the Lord direct you. Earnestly pray to him for direction, and he will direct you. Do not destroy present usefulness by over-anxiously calculating future contingencies, or forego certain advantages because you cannot have all advantages. My mind is so completely made up, that I trust I have been directed, and that you and I shall both in the end be satisfied that the best has been done.

I am much obliged to you for so carefully looking over the sheets * I sent you. The moment the whole is finished

* These were the sheets of Mr. Haldane's Address to the Public, concerning political opinions, and plans lately adopted, to promote Religion, in Scotland. After having urged him, for more than a twelvemonth, to vindicate himself from charges which so materially affected the credit of all the schemes he was engaged in, (Mr. Innes being out of the way, whose sentiments I knew to be similar to my own,) I had the utmost difficulty to prevent him from concealing

I will send it, and shall be glad to hear your remarks. Mr. Ritchie thinks he cannot be done till Friday or Saturday, but it is not his fault.

Kindest compliments to Mrs. Ewing, and believe me ever yours,

(Signed) R. H.

That the reader may understand the last part of the following letter, it is necessary to state, that on receiving the Accompts of the Tabernacle, Mr. Haldane had objected to the payment of a Book-case, which had been put up in the vestry, partly for holding the library, which I kept there for the use of the Class, and partly for holding in the lower part things needed in the Tabernacle. Although he had refused to pay this article with very aggravating provocation, absolutely charging me with an attempt to impose on him; I should not have published the part of the letter, which refers to it, had not the discussion led to a most important discovery (as will be seen afterwards) concerning the Class, which chiefly determined me to resign the charge of it.

Copy of a Letter to Mr. Haldane.

Glasgow, 4th June, 1800.

My Dear Sir,

I have now several letters from you to acknowledge, but I intend this as an answer particularly to yours of the 20th May, in which you reject my proposal of a meeting with you, your brother, and Mr. Innes, and advise me, without regarding the gentlemen who have acted with

a truth respecting Mr. Innes and myself, the effect of concealing which would have been, to have made my answer to the pastoral admonition, appear to be false. See Miss. Mag. Vol. IV. p. 299. In his letter to Mr. Dundas, he had said, "As citizens of this country, we conceive we have a right, and we "esteem it a duty, to speak freely our sentiments about government." It was not till I told him, that I should be under the necessity of publishing an explanation myself, and, if I mistake not, till the first proof-sheet of the passage had been thrown off, that he consented to insert the following paragraph.

"I have further to remark, that the above letters were written in London, and that the expression "as citizens, &c. we deem it our duty, &c." did not apply to my two associates in Scotland, who, as ministers of the gospel at home, always thought it their duty to act in the same manner, in every respect, as they would have done if missionaries abroad, and as having nothing to do with politics." Address, p. 22.

me hitherto, or getting any thing further settled as to the house, to proceed immediately to the formation of a church.

I proposed the meeting, in consequence of having been led to believe, that matters of common concern to the Scotch Tabernacles, should be made (when of sufficient importance) the subject of common consultation. But I have been probably mistaken here, as about other matters, respecting the general plan. If the other gentlemen shall be of your opinion, of course, no meeting can take place, and I must be deprived of their advice, as well as they, of the light which, from what I have seen here, I am able to throw upon the subject. I do not admit that it "regards you personally "more than it does any of us;" because you are not more personally concerned in your property, than we are in our principles and conduct. Neither can the sentiments entertained by any of the gentlemen at present, be an argument against a meeting, unless it be taken for granted, that no information or discussion, could produce a change. I thought, indeed, that the existence of a difference of opinion on so important a subject, was itself a sufficient reason for requesting a meeting, by which, through the divine blessing, we might all have been made of one mind.

Respecting the question itself, it strikes me as very surprising, that you should have supposed that my views were altered. The expression you allude to, is taken from one of my late letters, in which I mentioned what terms the other gentlemen and myself were willing to accede to, rather than be obliged to abandon a cause in which we had embarked. But that surely was a very different thing from stating what my views were, respecting what was right in itself for you to do, and necessary to the success of the undertaking. I should suppose, there is hardly a single fact, of which you must be more fully conscious, than this, that from the first moment you hinted to me the most distant intention, *not to dedicate these Tabernacles inalienably and for ever to the service of God, and to the full and Scriptural exercise of Christian liberty*, (of which I thought you entertained high ideas;) I discovered the strongest symptoms of disappointment and alarm. I was even slow to believe, or to understand what your words seemed to signify. This was so much the case, that when a meeting was held at your house, with a view to the forming of a church in Edinburgh, it was necessary for you to carry me into another room, to make me comprehend your meaning; and after all, the regulations proposed were acquiesced in,

(although not without reluctance) partly from the urgent necessity of forming a church, at all events, and partly from the hope that an agreement for the purchase of the intended house, might afterwards be made, on easy terms, and *no idea was, in that case, conceived, that the sale would be burdened with any regulations.*—You know further, that when you began to propose your plans about the Tabernacles here, with respect to being reimbursed with interest, or even being reimbursed in part, while the church, in return for what was remitted, must submit to certain regulations made for them, and implement certain pecuniary stipulations, *at the peril of expulsion, unless they would submit to the patronage of you and your heirs or assignees;* I say, you know, when these plans were mentioned, that I was so much agitated, that it was thought expedient, I should not be present during their discussion, and my attendance since, has been from necessity, not from choice.—You therefore had the earliest notice, which it was possible for me to give you, that I could not, in conscience, concur in the execution of your plans. This always was, and still is, the state of my mind.

You cease not, in every letter on this subject, to assert, "that you have been in one mind about this from the "beginning, either to keep the house in your own power, "or to get some considerable part of the price, if you gave it "up." I have no right to doubt the truth of an assertion so frequently and pointedly made, and yet it grieves me to think it should be true. For, in this case, you have, *from the beginning*, had your mind made up, respecting a circumstance which materially affects the character of your whole plan; but which you entirely concealed from me, as long as I was capable of deliberating upon it, in an independent situation. I agreed to the plan, in the simplicity of my heart, judging of it merely from the articles which were stated to me. I never dreamed that a single article was kept out of view, or that any stipulations were necessary, about the destination of a house, which I was led to consider, as fitted up not only for an allurement to sinners, but for an asylum to Christians of every denomination, who were disgusted either with patronage, or any other species of ecclesiastical imposition. I certainly do not regret leaving the Church of Scotland, but, in leaving it, I never would have knowingly embarked in a plan which admitted of patronage in the issue, as much as that church does, in any case whatever, and much more than the congregation I was connected with, can ever experience.

Lady Glenorchy made no demand of pecuniary reimbursement, and she gave security to the congregation, that *without their own consent and call*, they should never have a minister appointed by her, or her trustees. It was your duty to have made me acquainted, *from the beginning*, with every part of your plan, especially with an article so singular, and so important.

As I disapprove of the principle of your plan respecting the house, it may seem inconsistent in me to make any remarks on the particulars of it, yet I think myself called upon to do this, by the manner in which you seem to view them. "You speak of letting the church purchase the house "upon very advantageous terms." A thousand pounds sounds high, but it is more than counterbalanced by the single circumstance of a third part being free. The proposed terms will never seem advantageous to those, who consider the uncommon size of the house, and the peculiar restrictions under which it is to be sold. "You say, it is peculiarly "unnecessary to make a present of a house to a church in "so opulent a city as Glasgow;" and add, that "you can-"not help thinking the demands made upon you very "unreasonable." The opulence of the people is entirely out of the question, because they will pay just as much for the seats, if the house be given them in a present, as if they were to purchase it, and they will collect much more. As to getting a present, or making a demand upon you, no man would have thought either of the one, or the other, if your own measures had not excited expectation; and if, after all, you choose to refuse, I believe the people will allow that you may do what you will with your own. But there seems to be altogether an inaccuracy in such expressions; for the question is, not what present you should give the people, nor what demand they should make upon you, but at what expence can your plan be accomplished? You should have sat down first, and counted the cost. If you think it can be accomplished in the way you propose, I fear you will find there has been an error in the calculation.

You say that "you do not think I should press you further upon the business, nor you urge me;" and yet you immediately proceed to urge upon me a measure, which I told you long ago, I could never think of, in the present circumstances of the house. You propose that I should go on without the four gentlemen who have acted with me hitherto. Why, really, when I recollect the trouble they have taken, and the

obloquy they have endured, for the sake of a cause they have truly at heart, I think that this proposal, to say the least, is made rather with too little ceremony. If there were even no other objection to the formation of a church, than their reluctance, I should be almost ashamed to bid them go about their business. Besides, the attempt would be unlikely to succeed. For many, even of the simple and unwary, who might never otherwise have dreamed of danger, would be startled at their secession, and, probably, every respectable character would follow their example. The phalanx of our friends is already sufficiently small: it is quite unnecessary to give any of them their discharge. But the direct answer, on this point, is very simple. If I could see it my duty, I should be willing to make the attempt, at any risk; but as the gentlemen in question are affected by no other difficulties than those which affect myself, a discharge to them must be a discharge to me.—The situation of the church at Edinburgh does not appear to me, to be any argument in this business. Hardly any of its members are aware of their situation. And it remains a question, how far they will ever acquiesce in your views. No sooner did I see the full extent of those views, than I began to be alarmed at the part I had taken in the formation of the Edinburgh church.—I do not think that I am harrassing myself about futurity. The question respects present duty. While we ought to take no thought about the unseen events of to-morrow, we ought not knowingly to do that to-day, which we apprehend to be both wrong in principle, and mischievous in the issue.—" But it seems, at all events, " nothing now can be done till a church be formed, and then, " if need be, you will go west, and endeavour to settle with " them."—This seems to me, as much as saying, that the question cannot be considered, until it be decided. My scruples entirely hinge upon the point of forming a church. If that step shall once be taken, in the present circumstances, all the evils which I apprehend, must follow of course.—I cannot think you serious in saying, " that the business may " be as easily settled, after a church is formed, as now." Will it indeed be as easy to settle with four hundred as with four? No, the probability certainly is, that when you came west as you did before, and found the church as averse to your views, as the gentlemen in question are, you would, as you have done in the present case, desire to be urged no further on the business, and then we must either submit, however contrary to our judgement, or shift for ourselves;

in which case, I should be reduced to the alternative of choosing betwixt my pecuniary connection with the house, and my pastoral relation to the people. I should think it very unwarrantable to expose myself, or any of my Christian friends, to such a dilemma.—I am not at all conscious " of " destroying present usefulness by anxious calculation of " future contingencies, or of foregoing certain advantages, " because I cannot have all advantages." My present usefulness, I have good reason to think, is, in a great measure, suspended, and that because I have had too little jealousy about futurity. At any rate, no present advantage can authorise me to do, what I conceive to be evil, that good may come. If, under colour of extending my usefulness, I am unawares brought into a situation, which necessarily mars that usefulness, I cannot help it, " I must commit my way " unto the Lord, and wait for him."—It seems, " your mind " is so completely made up," that " you trust you have been " directed." By this rule, I might perhaps argue with equal force, that I am directed too, and so here would be divine direction leading contrary ways.—But I do not willingly insist. My sole object is to state distinctly and finally, what you must know to have all along been my views upon the subject in debate; especially as the reasons of my present conduct must soon be declared.

I find there is another unpleasant business, which, though of a more personal and private nature than the above, must, it seems, be formally discussed betwixt us. To a man in my circumstances, the value of the matter that is disputed, is not altogether a trifle, and yet, I doubt, if I should say a word about it, if your conduct respecting it did not involve the imputation of an attempt on my part, to make an unjust charge. I allude to the Book-case in the vestry of the Tabernacle. That, it seems, you refuse to pay, alleging that it is too expensive, and that, at any rate, I agreed to provide accommodations for the class. You will, no doubt, remember, that I mentioned my wish to have a Book-case for the class, and did so while I was mentioning other things wanted in the Tabernacle. You must surely have seen, that I could have no reason for mentioning that wish, unless I expected you to pay for it; if therefore, you meant not to do so, it would have been proper to have given me fair warning, or, at least, to have said that I was entitled to do as I pleased, in an affair of my own. Instead of this, however, you gave your consent to the proposal in such a way, that I understood you authorised me to get the

Book-case, and that of such size and kind as I thought proper. The one which I did get, seemed to me neither too large nor too fine for the purpose. It is already almost filled, and although you remarked, after seeing it, that the glass was unnecessary, yet as I would not have put my books into open shelves, the difference of expence could not have been great. Besides, where no pattern was prescribed, I could not be blamed for following my own judgement. The article seems to me quite as plain and economical as was consistent with decency and convenience.—I no doubt, " agreed to provide " accommodations for the class," according to the number proposed at first, and you agreed to give me 10*l.* annually for each of the students. But I did not insist on what was advantageous to me in this original agreement, when the number was increased. I not only consented that my allowance should not increase, but even gave up that which I might have claimed as arrears due me, for four students more than the number twenty, for whom payment was made. Thus I voluntarily consented, not only to a diminution of salary and an increase of labour, but also to a necessary increase of expence in the article of books; little imagining, that for my reward in what I gave up, I might be brought in for a further expence for accommodations, especially as I was told that the Tabernacle, when ready, should be at my service for that purpose. After such liberal dealing, on my part, it is rather with a bad grace, that I am so sharply reminded of my original agreement. I certainly can have no objection to its being fully revived, and rigidly observed, in all its parts. If I must still pay for all accommodations to the class, then I suppose, I am also in debt for a table and two forms, if not for rent for the use of the vestry. On the other hand, I should have an allowance for the use of my furniture in the vestry on Sabbath and other preaching days, and especially for the lower half of the Book-case, which is almost wholly occupied with things which belong to the Tabernacle, and was intended for that purpose when made.—A discussion of this nature is not very suitable to the connection which has subsisted betwixt us; nor is it calculated to encourage me in the exertions I make to add to my library, at a very considerable expence.—On this affair, therefore, you shall not probably hear more from me. If you choose to pay the sum in question, you will do that which, I conceive, you ought to have done long ago, without making Mr. Harley lie out of his money, and without giving me any trouble

about it: if you do not, I shall find myself brought in for the payment of a debt, which I never dreamed of contracting, for which I shall never be able to recover value, and in the demand for which is implied the supposition, that I am capable of attempting to use improper liberties with your purse. I am,

My Dear Sir,

Very faithfully, Yours,

Greville Ewing.

Copy of the Answer.

Edinburgh, June 7th, 1800.

My Dear Sir,

I yesterday received your letter of the 4th, by which I observe you are displeased because I did not agree to the meeting you proposed. The alteration of a solemn Contract * betwixt you and me, without the consent of both parties, can never be a proper subject of discussion in any meeting whatever; nor do I see any likelihood that any thing could be suggested, that would lead me to depart from the principle I set out upon, of which I have so often reminded † you, and of the propriety of adhering to which, I am thoroughly satisfied.

I have already so fully explained myself, as to the reasons for adhering to what is settled, that I think it unnecessary any more to go over the same ground, and it is painful to enter into the different parts of your letter. I must say, however, you appear to me to be very unreasonable in this business.

By your own account, you must have understood my views many months before our agreement was drawn out.—You say, from the first moment I hinted to you the most distant intention not to dedicate these Tabernacles inalienably, &c. you discovered the strongest symptoms of disappointment and alarm; that you was even slow to believe or to understand what I seemed to signify—"this," you observe,

* This is the Contract, which he now wishes to set aside.

† The word "reminded" is quite improper here; it implies that the principle was originally told me, which it was not. He takes for granted the very thing I had denied, without attempting to prove, or even venturing directly to assert it.

" was so much the case, that when a meeting was held at " your house, with a view to the forming of a church in " Edinburgh—it was necessary for you to carry me into " another room, to make me *comprehend your meaning*." From the above, it appears you did comprehend my meaning almost from the beginning * of these plans; and many months afterwards you entered into a formal agreement to *preach the gospel*, and *dispense the ordinances* in the Glasgow house, and you told me that agreement was drawn out exactly according to the promise I had from the first made you. I am not quoting your words, but such was distinctly the meaning you conveyed to me, when coming out of Mr. Duncan's, I asked you if it was not so. You next speak of the regulations being acquiesced in, partly from the hope that the house might afterwards be purchased on easy terms: I never remember that such an idea was thrown out as to your house †, till after the agreement was signed. As to your agitation, which made it necessary for you not to be present when discussions took place about that house, these discussions were long after the agreement, and, therefore, it is nothing to the purpose ‡.

You constantly repeat the term patronage, as if the very sound should frighten us from deliberating upon the subject,

* The reader is requested to remark the word " almost" here. My complaint was, that Mr Haldane did not tell me his meaning *from the beginning;* his answer is, that he told it me ALMOST *from the beginning*. This evasion is the more improper, that it is introduced with a formal argument, that my knowledge of his meaning as to the Edinburgh Tabernacle, implied a knowledge of it as to the Glasgow one. Had this been even true, it would have only been, as he says, a knowledge *almost* from the beginning. But it was not true; for the Edinburgh Tabernacle, though connected with the other two, was never understood to be on the same footing with them. My disappointment, alarm, and slowness to believe or comprehend his meaning, in the first instance, was entirely confined to the explanation given as to the house to be built in Edinburgh. The same expressions of disapprobation were afterwards called forth at Glasgow, in a still stronger degree; but from what had happened at Edinburgh, I did not foresee that they would be called forth. It was not till after the event, that I perceived Mr. Haldane's determination to apply the same principle to all, however different the cases might be.

† Certainly not as to the Glasgow house. It was evidently of the Edinburgh house I was there speaking. Terms of sale for the Glasgow house had not then been once hinted.

‡ Another instance of evasion. I mentioned the expressions of my surprise and grief, as proof that I had not been informed of every part of the plan fairly from the beginning. In this view, they were perfectly to the purpose, however long after the agreement.

but I told you before I did not desire to be possessed of it: besides I see no connection it has with this business *.

As to your insinuation, that I kept any article out of view, for some time, of our settlement, I give it no answer, only, that I agree with you, that from the beginning it was my duty to acquaint you with every part of my plan, and to conceal nothing, and that I never did conceal any thing †.

I am still of opinion that, notwithstanding the size of the house, it would be giving it to a church upon very advantageous terms to let them have it 1000*l.* below what it cost; respecting any regulations, these I am willing to converse upon with you, or any others, and doubt not we could easily settle them ‡. My calculations may be wrong as to these houses, but I do not see it at present, if it be so. I think churches may be well pleased to have accommodation afforded them gratis, and if they wish for property, to get it at less than two-thirds of its value.

I really did hope, from not hearing, that your church had been formed, as it cannot be contrary to any principle you

* The origin of patronage was exactly the principle of Mr. Haldane, viz. the claim of a right to appoint the minister, founded on the property of a place of worship. Mr. Haldane was willing to sell his property, under the burden of a particular plan; but, if no body would buy it, he was determined that the property and the patronage should go together. I do not mean, at present, to discuss this principle. I only remark it, as having been acted upon by Mr. Haldane, although all his friends, I believe, had been previously led to suppose, that it was one of his objections to the Established Church.

† Here Mr. Haldane and I are completely at issue. I have ever said, and do say, that if Mr. Haldane really had his mind made up from the beginning, about either offering these houses to sale, or retaining them as private property, he ought to have informed me of the circumstance, from the beginning, that is, at the time when he proposed that I should co-operate with him in the scheme However defensible this part of his design may be thought by some to be, I should have been informed of it. But I was not. Nor has Mr. Haldane been able to refer to any time or place of his doing so, till the discussion was brought on at an after period. He does not even venture to contradict me. The above sentence is a very singular one. At first he spurns at my insinuation, and will give it no answer. He then agrees with me that it was his duty to acquaint me with every part of his plan. Well, then, did he acquaint me with every part of it? He does not venture to say that. No, he changes to a negative phrase, "and to conceal nothing, and "that I never did conceal any thing." Now, as far as concealment may imply design, I can only speak by inference, and I have no right, nor desire, to draw unfavourable inferences. On the fact, however, of concealment, and culpable concealment, I have ever been decided. Mr. Haldane has never ventured directly to deny, has never been so candid as directly to admit, my assertion.

‡ This had been already tried and found impracticable.

hold to do so; you told me when in town, you had proposed to the other gentlemen to do it, of course you did not think it wrong in itself *. You complain of my proposing that you should leave the other gentlemen. I do not bid you desert them, and they would be no worse off, if the church was formed; if they cannot go along with you in it, I do not see the harm of doing it without them, nor that doing so would argue any ingratitude on your part for their attention. Mr. Harley, however, told my brother in Edinburgh, that there were other reasons †, besides settling with me, that prevented your church from being formed, but declined stating them. Of these, not knowing them, I cannot speak, but as far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that I have done right, and that for the consequences of a church not being now formed, or any thing else, I am not answerable. You speak of soon declaring the reasons of your present conduct; I would only say, you should be careful to state the business precisely as it stands.—You made a settlement with me, both "to "preach the gospel and dispense the ordinances," but you refuse to do the latter, because you and I cannot agree upon the terms on which our Contract should be disannulled.—Recollect always that the proposals afterwards ‡ were mere conversations, by which I declared I was not bound till these plans should be matured and weighed; while, on the other hand, the Contract || was deliberately entered into, by mutual consent, which I am willing to stand to. I again repeat that *there is no propriety in one party urging another to depart from a mutual agreement* §, far less have you a right to say that I am unreasonable, because I do not choose to do so, or to adopt the plan you propose.

* This is a fair specimen of a vexatious mode of wresting my words, with which I have long been harrassed. I had told Mr. Haldane, that the other gentlemen were averse to forming a church as well as I, that I had made the proposal to them, and found this to be the case. No fair use could be made of this mode of speaking, except that I had consulted them on the subject, and had ascertained their sentiments. It could never be understood to imply, that I did not think it wrong, in existing circumstances, because it was the object of my conversation to show that I did. As to any abstract question, whether the formation of a church be right or wrong "in itself," on that we had no dispute.

† I know not what is here alluded to.

‡ I recollect always the want of proposals beforehand.

|| This is the Contract, which he now wishes to set aside.

§ Under these words a line is drawn by Mr. Haldane himself in the original letter; and this is the case, in all the passages of his letters, which are printed in italics.

As to the Book-press, I am sorry you have said so much upon it, because it makes it necessary for me, also to speak of matters between us that can serve no good purpose.—You say you did not insist on the 10*l.* for the additional students. I will explain myself on that matter.—Mr. Bogue had 40*l.* a-year for his successive classes, consisting of four students each. When I proposed to send him twenty, I by no means thought 10*l.* each, was the reasonable proportionate sum, but *from various circumstances, I wished to give him* beyond the proportion. When the class was transferred to you, I was also satisfied that *it should be so* with you *. My first agreement, however, was for one class, fifteen months. I would, of course, have given you the additional 50*l.* when I increased the class, but at such a rate, I never would have continued them longer than the fixed time †.

I may be wrong, but I believe 200*l.* a-year is much above the usual payment expected for such business, and 600*l.* for three year's tuition is a large sum, the books belonging to you, of course, at the end of it.—I know when Messrs. Slatterie, Little, and Roby spoke of the classes proposed in England, their ideas were very different as to what would be expected by tutors ‡. I, however, proposed, and do propose, that you should have the 200*l.* also for the second class, and not conceiving much additional trouble to arise from an additional number, beyond Mr. Bogue's four, I always considered it *extra* payment. I, therefore, had no more idea of paying for the Book-press than for the Books ‖, and when

* Here again was a completely new, and most mortifying, view of my connection with Mr. Haldane as to the class. I shall not enter on this subject at present, as I shall afterwards produce a document containing my sentiments on it at full length. I have only to say here, that this is another instance, in which Mr. Haldane brought me into a situation, which he did not fairly explain to me, till it was too late. On the footing here described, I would not have engaged to teach a class for any man, for a single hour.

† Of this I know nothing, except that when the time was proposed to be lengthened, a reason entirely different from any thing stated above, was assigned to me by Mr Haldane. Besides, the classes were always represented as likely to be permanent.

‡ These words are so framed, as to imply that I had entertained extravagant expectations, or made exorbitant demands. I demanded nothing: I expected nothing. The terms, like the classes, were solely the proposal of Mr. Haldane. After he had himself made them, I certainly did not deserve to have invidious comparisons drawn, between my *expectations*, and those of other tutors.

‖ I cannot be persuaded that this is correct, because, when he saw that it had glass doors, he found fault in a way, which he could never have thought

you spoke to me of putting it up, no more conceived I was to pay it, than you did, when I consulted you about placing the pulpit, that you was to pay for the alteration. Further, I told you, when offering 150*l.* for the students without Books, that I would take Book-press, tables, seats, &c. with the Books *. I confess, that I was astonished when Mr. Harley presented the account of it to me. I told him our agreement, which he thought a very ample recompence.

My dear Mr. Ewing, I am quite ashamed, when I am writing thus; why did you make it necessary for my own vindication †? I shall desire Mr. Harley to pay it immediately.—Let there be no strife between you and me, especially about these matters. May I beg it as a favour, you will not mention it again to me, or any thing about our pecuniary settlements, for these two classes; I intreat this of you, and I further intreat you will put this letter, and any letter of mine, that may have offended you, in the fire ‡. If we cannot see alike, why should we quarrel? Your last letter is written perhaps with too much heat, and perhaps my present one is so too. Let this disagreeable work end. Heat will do no good, but only tend to throw stumbling (words) blocks in each others way, which there is little need for.—It will give me sincere pleasure, if you can see it your duty still to form

of, unless he had expected to pay it. He had agreed, that the vestry should be fitted up for the class. The impression on my own mind is, that he never conceived the idea of disputing the payment of it, till he thought it was too expensive. The amount will be seen in the accounts.

* I remember nothing of this offer, beyond a deduction of 50*l.* annually, to furnish the students himself with books, and to buy my stock of books. Had the Book-press been named, I think I must have observed it.

† Because Mr. Haldane had made it necessary for mine. And since this was the view which he took of the classes, it was well that any thing occurred, however late, to bring it at last to light. I took little notice of the discovery at the time, but as soon as I began to reflect, and found Mr. Haldane serious in his assertion; from that hour it became impossible for me to continue beyond my existing engagement, to teach, *on any terms*, a class for Mr. Haldane.

‡ This last request, I told Mr. Haldane, I durst not comply with, because my confidence in him was now so completely shaken, that I knew not what use I might have for his letters; and I gave him, I said, fair warning, that he might, if he chose, keep my letters to him, and be on his guard, as to what he might write to me. A mutual stipulation to burn letters on both sides, as the condition of a reconciliation, is, indeed, of a very sacred nature, and ought to be faithfully observed, when it has been made. But to write offensive letters, and then to ask a man to burn them, is not to conciliate, but to ask a favour, which it may not always be safe to grant. Had I granted the favour in this instance, I should have deprived myself of a document of great importance, in my present situation.

your church. Perhaps the matter in dispute may never interest many who may come together.—A year has nearly passed away, since you might have enjoyed the ordinances with your people, of which you have been deprived, and a year is a considerable portion of your life and theirs.—I pray that you may be directed to what is right, and with my kindest compliments to Mrs. Ewing, I remain very affectionately, and with much esteem, yours sincerely,

(Signed) ROBERT HALDANE.

P. S. Please tell Mr. Harley, that Mr. Oswald has [to be] paid 28*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.* feu, which by your contract, falls to be paid off the funds of the house, which of course, he will immediately settle. Tell him, I wish he could send me the accounts when convenient, that we might close them, and to include the Book-case.—This afternoon, I have sent to the carrier's for you three dozen of port-wine, of which I beg your acceptance. Ever yours,

(Signed) R. H.

This letter, which, take it all in all, is one of the most extraordinary productions I have ever seen, except from the same gentleman, had no effect in reconciling my mind to the measure of forming a church. My reason for introducing it, and the preceding ones here, is, that they afford incontestible evidence, that as the tack or contract *originated* with Mr. Haldane, so it was he who insisted that it should *continue in force.* At first, no agreement could be made, except between us two, because we were then the only parties concerned. Afterwards when a congregation was collected, I wanted an agreement to be made with them, which was what Mr. Haldane had uniformly given me reason to expect, and to which, indeed, he made no objection, till his terms were declined. He entered most zealously into the proposal, and came to Glasgow, as he said, to settle with us; and persisted for a considerable time, in his attempts to make a bargain, for the sale of the house; but because he could get nobody to accept of such terms as would have put them to serious inconvenience, and eventually have involved them in loss, (if things had gone on, as they have done;) he refused to let the contract be set aside. The reader is requested, therefore, to observe, that if there be any thing in this contract unsuitable to the connection of a pastor and a church, (of which, however, I am not in the smallest degree conscious,)

it was not with my will, that it was permitted to continue. I wanted, as Mr. Haldane expresses it, to disannull the contract, p. 55. In answer to this, Mr. Haldane, p. 42, says, "The more I think of it, the more I am satisfied that your "present agreement should stand, (written, as you know, "after a very full explanation made long before:") again, p. 52, he says, "the alteration of a solemn contract betwixt "you and me, without the consent of both parties, can never "be a proper subject of discussion in any meeting whatever;"—p. 55, "the contract was deliberately entered into, "by mutual consent, which I am willing to stand to. I again "repeat, that *there is no propriety in one party urging another to "depart from a mutual agreement*, far less have you a right to "say, that I am unreasonable, because I do not choose to do "so, or to adopt the plan you propose."

Mr. Haldane says, Letters, page 24, "you wished me "indeed, to renounce *my right* to the property of the house, "but you did not at the same time propose to give up *your "right*, during your incumbency, conveyed by the bond." The reader will see, by the preceding correspondence, that *my right* was no part of the dispute, and no difficulty in the way of settling it. To have made the proposal, which he now blames me for with-holding, would have broken off the treaty, instead of forwarding it. But though I did not speak of this proposal, I had very nearly acted on it, for I was on the point, as many of my friends know, of abandoning the Tabernacle altogether. As to making proposals on the business, I soon saw very clearly, that unless I could make the proposal of advancing to Mr. Haldane 500*l.* and finding him security for principal and interest of the rest of his demands, I could say nothing to purpose on the subject.

Soon after these letters had passed between Mr. Haldane and me, I went to Edinburgh; and as neither by conversation nor correspondence had we been able to come to any agreement between ourselves, we met for discussing the subject, in the presence of two common friends, and another came in towards the end of the conversation. We then went over the same ground, as we had done in our previous correspondence, and each persisted in his own views. Our brethren naturally deprecated a rupture between us. They justly observed, that whatever truth might be in my representations respecting Mr. Haldane's concealment of his intentions from me, yet as all our conversations on the subject had been private and confidential, no evidence could be

produced against him. This I readily admitted, and was perfectly sensible, that I could never make my complaint a subject of church discipline. But the difficulty with me was, how I could go on, in connection with a man, who had forfeited my confidence. They observed to me, that, by our agreement, I was perfectly independent of him; that the church, which might be formed, were sure of the house at least as long as I was with them; that though I might be disappointed in my hopes of seeing the house permanently secured to them, yet it would be a very strong measure, to leave, on that account, so great a sphere of usefulness; and, that the triumph which it would give to enemies, were it known that any misunderstanding had taken place between Mr. Haldane and me, should lead me to make every sacrifice possible, in order to prevent it. On these grounds, I consented to give up all further dispute with Mr. Haldane; and to form a church in Glasgow, provided I obtained the consent of my friends there. I also consented to forgive him the injury, which I thought he had done me. A reconciliation took place accordingly, which was *bona fide* on my part, though the opinion I had of the manner in which I had been used, was entirely the same. The reader is again requested to observe, that my reason for producing these letters, is by no means to rip up an old sore, but to produce necessary evidence of the situation in which Mr. Haldane and I really stand, in regard to the tack or contract, which he now wishes to set aside. I feel it necessary also, from the many insinuations which he is circulating against my character, to lay open the whole history of our connections since their commencement.

In order to reconcile my friends in Glasgow, to the formation of a church, without any settlement with Mr. Haldane, the gentleman, who came in towards the end of the above meeting, proposed to write me a letter explaining what he knew to be the situation and views of the church in Edinburgh. This proposal was approved by Mr. Haldane, and the letter was written, by his authority, and given to me in the course of a few days. I subjoin a copy of it.

Edinburgh, 8th July, 1800.

My Dear Sir,

The footing upon which you parted with us has afforded a daily gratification to our feelings, and, I trust, that the brethren with you will now be participating in our

happiness.—As you would mention the views of the church here, with regard to the same matter, I have thought it might, perhaps, be of some use thus to state them.

We consider ourselves as having nothing to do with the Circus, and look forward to the Tabernacle merely as a place where we will be accommodated in worship. The church, who are not to bear any part of the expence of erecting it, will have nothing to do with the property of it. We consider it amongst our mercies, that we have a place of worship, without laying out money in purchasing a house, and that unless we voluntarily choose to give something towards defraying the expence of the house, we may sit with as little cost as if still in a Parish Church. In the way of collection at the door, some of us, I believe, give a little more liberally, with the view of aiding the expence of the house, but nothing is said upon the matter. There is no connection whatsoever betwixt the church, and the management of the house; but merely that the Deacons take by turns, the charge of collecting, a service which although they think it their duty to do, is rendered by them voluntarily —it being no part of their proper duty as Deacons of the church.

The collections given at the doors by the audience or the church, are applied solely in defraying the expence of the house. We take no concern with them whatsoever.—Our poor brethren are supported from the proper funds of the church—which arise from the donations of the brethren given at rising from the Lord's table. Should these be insufficient, the church is informed, that the donations may be augmented.—Should there even be a surplus in the public collections at the doors of the house, and the proprietor be also disposed to give that surplus in aid of the *church* funds, I, for one, would hesitate in receiving it—as it would be making the public pay for the church, and would, as I think, infer an obligation to take charge of the poor amongst the audience—the congregation at large.

Were it necessary, I think that the use made of the collections at the doors, should be publicly notified—at same time, I presume that the public here understand it perfectly well. Every body knows that there must be expence attending such an institution, and that it must be paid; and it is reasonable to suppose that the collections, (the alone ostensible mean,) must be first resorted to.—No person can reasonably find fault, although not a farthing of the money collected at

the doors of dissenting houses were given in any way to the poor. We all, though dissenters, are bound by law to pay parish rates, and would be entitled to supply from that quarter, if in need.—But even were there a surplus after defraying all expences, and to be disposed of in alms, I should think that an application, having more immediately in view—the relief of the soul (as Mr. H. proposes), would be preferable.

Yours, affectionately.

This letter was written with the knowledge and consent of Mr. Haldane. It contains a correct account of what was the situation of the church at Edinburgh at that time, and every article in it was, in the conversation above-mentioned, proposed, offered, and urged, by Mr. Haldane, as what he wished to be the situation of a church to be formed in the Tabernacle in Glasgow. I have ever considered the letter, as the same in point of authority, as if it had been written by Mr. Haldane himself. It was agreed, at the meeting in presence of our friends, that such a letter should be written me. This letter was written accordingly; and it was written for this express purpose, that I might not be left to the uncertainty of a fugitive verbal explanation, but might have a written document, to read to the gentlemen who had been dealt with before, and to any other hearers in the Tabernacle, who might wish for information on the subject. I did so. In the faith of this letter, we thought ourselves safe to form a church in a house belonging to Mr. Haldane. We were assured by it, that "unless we voluntarily chose to give "something towards defraying the expence of the house, "we might sit with as little cost as if still in a Parish "church." Of this assurance, for which certainly we were very much obliged to him, we are well intitled to say, we have taken no improper advantage. We have met it, with at least equal liberality. Besides taking seats, and making ample collections for objects, in which Christians at large feel an interest; we have been, for years, in the habit of contributing, both publicly and in private, to build houses, on the recommendation of Mr. Haldane. In this way, we have given much more than would buy the Tabernacle, or build a better house. I believe the Tabernacle of Glasgow was the most fertile source of supply for these purposes, in all Scotland. Having no house to build for ourselves, we felt a call on us, to be the more liberal in helping to build

for others. Such was our confidence in Mr. Haldane, that, at his own suggestion, we declined assisting to build any house, the rights of which he did not certify, to have been written or revised, by a man of business. On many of those houses, Mr. Haldane had security for money which he lent, and had it not been for our contributions, which were all in the way of free donation, his securities (though certainly not a gaining concern) would have been less valuable. We presume, therefore, that, in a pecuniary point of view, we owe him nothing. The reader will observe, that, after the assurance given us in the above letter, and the exertions made in the faith of it, Mr. Haldane now changes his tone, and says, we ought to provide for ourselves.

Since writing this account, I have made inquiry at the gentlemen who were present at the above-mentioned conversation, and I find (as might be expected in so distant an occurrence, in which they were not so immediately concerned as I was) that their recollection of the particular circumstances is very imperfect. My only doubt relates to the time, when the writer of the letter came in. I think, as I have stated above, that he came in at the end of our conversation in the morning, and this at first he thought himself. In consequence, however, of what has been brought to his recollection since, by another of the gentlemen, he thinks that he did not come in at the conversation in the morning, but at a conversation in the evening in Mr. Haldane's house, where the subject of our dispute was again discussed, but *at which I was not present*. I never heard of that conversation before, but can well believe it may have taken place, and am of opinion that it goes far to explain the impression which the gentlemen now say, was made upon their minds. It is, indeed, stated by one of them to have had its own share of influence in producing that impression. "After hearing both parties," he says, "*and having had a "further conversation on the subject in the evening, (at which "Mr. Ewing, I think, was not present)* and in which "Mr. ——— having come in, took part, the impression "made on all our minds, was, that Mr. Ewing had mis-"understood Mr. Haldane, and that Mr. Haldane had not "given him reason to expect that he had any intention of "making a gift of the Tabernacle to the church." Be this as it may, my views of the subject have already been stated, and the reader may suspend his judgement, till he shall hear what may be said on the other side. The only

assertion which I make positively, as to the matter of fact, in this affair, is, *that the letter was written with the knowledge and consent of Mr. Haldane, and contained his professed sentiments at that time.* For this I can appeal not only to the gentlemen who were present at our discussion in Edinburgh, and who are united at least as to its containing Mr. Haldane's sentiments, but to the tenor of the letter itself, and to several members of the church in Glasgow, who remember it very distinctly, (having felt so immediately interested in its contents,) and who can bear witness, not only as to the purpose for which I gave it them at the time to read, but also as to the acknowledgement of it by Mr. Haldane, when they mentioned it to him afterwards, in conversation, or in letters.

I shall next produce a copy of certain regulations, which were adopted by the original members of the church. They were printed, not as any authority distinct from that of Scripture, but merely to save trouble in answering the queries of individuals, till our practice should be sufficiently known and understood; and accordingly the circulation of them was soon discontinued. The laying of them aside, was owing to no change of principle, but merely because they had now answered the purpose for which they were printed. I produce them, at present, as a specimen of our known principles at the time, which may be compared with my late Statement on Church Government, and with a view to enable my readers to judge whether Mr. Haldane has made a fair use of them, in his late publication. He was furnished with a copy of them soon after they were printed.

Copy of the Regulations of the Church, Jamaica-Street.

Besides the ordinary Public Worship of the Lord's Day, there shall be a Church Meeting weekly, for the purposes of Social Worship, Discipline, and Mutual Edification.

The Lord's Supper shall be administered every Lord's Day, when the Minister is present, or when a Minister can be procured to officiate in his stead.

After dispensing the Lord's Supper, a Collection shall be made by the Communicants for defraying the expence of the Communion Elements, and for the Poor; and an adequate number of Deacons shall be chosen by the Church, and appointed to receive and apply the money thus collected, according to the direction of the Church.

Persons desirous of admission into the Church, shall apply to the Minister; upon his reporting their desire to the Church, some of the Members shall be requested to converse with them, and, if necessary, inquire into their character; if the result be unsatisfactory or dubious, the report shall be made to the Minister in private; if favourable, it shall be reported at a Church Meeting, and the question may be put as to their admission, when the consent of the Church shall be signified by holding up the right hand. When the question is thought to need further consideration, a delay may be requested, but if any one have objections to the person proposed, he must, at least in the first instance, state them in private.

N. B. No personal remarks, or injurious reports affecting character, to be allowed in the Church. In the case even of an impenitent offender, our Saviour does not allow the offence to be told to the Church, until means be previously used, "that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word "may be established."

Any Member giving offence, shall be dealt with according to the rules laid down in Scripture, and when the offence is told to the Church, he shall be admonished, rebuked, expelled, or restored, at a Church meeting, and by the Church.

Pious people of evangelical sentiments of every denomination, shall be admissible occasionally to the Lord's Table, and the Members of the Church shall be at liberty to communicate occasionally with those of other denominations.

Occasional Communicants, when their desire is known in time, shall be admitted by the Church at the preceding Church meeting; when their application is too late for this, they may be admitted by the Minister, either upon his personal knowledge, or upon the particular recommendation of a Member of the Church. In the latter case, they shall be named by the Minister, at the Communion Table, previously to dispensing the ordinance.

The foregoing Rules shall be read to every Member upon admission into the Church, for his or her acquiescence and approbation.

Soon after this period, it became necessary for me to have assistance in preaching. At first we had worship in the Tabernacle, only in the mornings and evenings. I had also occasional help from ministers from England, and afterwards from some of the students at the first class. When that

class was about to break up, I requested Mr. Haldane to allow one of them to remain with me, and to authorise me to appropriate a part of the proceeds of the house for his support. On this subject I have to produce the following documents.

Extract of a Letter to me from Mr. Robert Haldane.

Dated Dunkeld, October, 2d, 1800.

———" Notwithstanding our agreement about " the Tabernacle, I hereby authorise you to pay your " Assistant out of the funds of the house, and think you " should not delay choosing and appointing him, for one " day."———

" *P. S.* Perhaps you had better not name a sum for your " Assistant, till we meet and settle every thing."

Extract of a Letter to me from Mrs. Haldane.

———" As it may be agreeable to you, Mr. H. in " his own hand will, at the foot of this letter, authorise you " to pay Mr. Greig the sum you desire for next year."——

Copy of the Note mentioned above.

" My Dear Sir,

" I HEREBY authorise you to pay Mr. G. " Greig, whom you have chosen as your Assistant for next " year, the sum you propose, viz. seventy pounds sterling. " I am, &c.

" (Signed) Robert Haldane."

Edinburgh, October 27th, 1800.

Copy of a Letter to me from Mr. Robert Haldane.

Edinburgh, November 2d, 1801.

Sir,

Although by the tack of the Tabernacle at Glasgow between you and me, dated 8th July, 1799, it is stipulated, that after retaining the sum therein mentioned yearly, for the maintenance of yourself and family, paying the ground-rents or feu-duties to the superior, the ordinary

expences of the house, and the necessary repairs of it, you are to account for and pay over the residue and remainder of the seat-rents and offerings, or collections, at the said Tabernacle or place of public worship, to me, and the other persons therein named, to be applied for the uses therein mentioned, yet I hereby declare, that after the other payments above mentioned, before you shall be accountable for the said residue of the seat-rents and offerings or collections, you shall also be entitled to pay yearly to an assistant minister to be appointed by you, such salary as the said seat-rents, offerings, and collections can afford, or admit of, not exceeding the sum of one hundred pounds sterling, yearly, to commence from and after the term of Martinmas in this present year. I am,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

(Signed) ROBERT HALDANE.

To Mr. Greville Ewing.

Copy of the Postscript to a Letter to me from Mr. Robert Haldane.

Dated Edinburgh, October 16th, 1804.

" *P. S.* I forgot to say, that there will surely be no need " to give more to the Assistant going to you, than what the " house affords, after paying last year's arrears *. You " know he will have much more than any of his com- " panions."

Although I complied with this request of Mr. Haldane's, I am authorised by his letter of November 2d, 1801, inserted above, to apply any sum, from the proceeds of the house, for the support of an Assistant, not exceeding 100*l.* per annum. See also page 37, Regulation 2.

I think it right to add here, a sentence out of the letter itself.—" WE HAVE APPOINTED for you, one of the name of " Hendry, who I hope will answer." For this appointment we were all very much obliged to Mr. Haldane and his friends; and in saying so, I believe I speak the sentiments of

* See the Accompts.

the church, as well as my own. But the reader will afterwards see my reason for ascertaining the fact, as to the persons who appointed Mr. Hendry. If Mr. Haldane say, this appointment was subject to my consent; I can truly answer, that my consent was also subject to that of the church. For although, in these documents, I am authorised to pay an Assistant chosen by myself; and although, as pastor, I feel it my duty to take care, that no one preach in the church whom I do not approve; yet I have all along offered (which Mr. Haldane perfectly knows) to submit the choice of my Assistants to the church, declaring that I had no doubt, I should have reason to be satisfied with any they fixed on; and it has always been understood, that their declining to do so, (except a few who gave in the names of particular preachers,) has arisen from their being persuaded, that such as I employed in the mean time, were as suitable as any who could be obtained.

I now return to the subject of the class. When I undertook to teach it, I did so, on the express condition, that, besides other things, I should give them as much Greek and Hebrew, as might enable them afterwards to prosecute the study of the Scriptures in the original languages. From this condition, which I thought the most important one in the whole scheme, Mr. Haldane often showed an earnest desire to depart. When I told him what we were doing, he seldom made any remark at the time, but I was sure to get a letter of expostulation afterwards, when it was necessary to write a formal vindication. He was never present in the class himself above three or four times; but if any student had gone to Edinburgh to visit his friends, and waited on Mr. Haldane, a number of queries were put to him, respecting the length of the lessons. and the time occupied in preparing them; and the information obtained in this way, either produced a long letter to me, or was brought out upon me in conversation, often at a very distant period, and sometimes without telling me explicitly what had really been said. What teazed me most, in the matter, was, that he was always most opinionative on those subjects, with which he was least acquainted. I give, as a specimen, the following extract:

Edinburgh, January 24th, 1800.

My Dear Sir,

* * * \

they cannot learn Latin, they need not Hebrew, which perhaps twenty of the ministers of the Church of Scotland do not understand.—While, therefore, I object to the Hebrew, I conceive you should even relax in the Greek, if you find they have not sufficient time to read, which ought surely to be a principal part of their present business. I think it would tend rather to their edification and increase in knowledge, to spend more time in the class, searching and explaining the Scriptures, (I am aware of your answer to this) and giving them your own clear views of the truths it contains. If near the end of the course, you wish to give them a little of the Hebrew grammar, it may be done; you will remember that doing so with the Greek was all we originally intended. I am,

My Dear Sir,

Yours most sincerely.

(Signed) R. H.

Another grievance I felt in the class was, the situation of the students. When I undertook to teach them, the allowance for their support was fixed, at what Mr. Haldane then thought to be sufficiently moderate. The expence of living soon rose, and continued rising to an unprecedented degree; yet Mr. Haldane would admit of no increased allowance, and was much displeased with me for wishing to treat them, as he said, so much like gentlemen.

On these accounts, I soon felt uneasy in this part of my situation. The various difficulties and labours of the Tabernacle also made it impossible for me (especially for a first and second course) to attend as I wished to the education of the students. Of this circumstance, which was easily foreseen, I warned Mr. Haldane from the very beginning; and unless I had found the task made as pleasant to me, as it was made the reverse, I should not, at any rate, have been able to persevere with spirit. Had it not been, however, for the discovery which Mr. Haldane made, in his discussion about the Bookcase, (and to which he afterwards adhered,) of the manner in which he had treated me, by proposing higher terms than he thought reasonable; I should not have so speedily decided on refusing all further offers. If he had at once proposed to employ another, I should have felt it a deliverance. If he had rested content with my simple compliance or refusal, to which he requested I would confine myself, when he first

proposed to me another class, I should have been greatly relieved. I suppose he expected I would comply, and thought that waving a discussion of his proposal, was the best way to make it pass, as neither unreasonable nor extraordinary. But after finding that I gave a refusal, he insisted that it was my duty to have complied; assigned many reasons for his proposal, which only increased my regret, that ever I had undertaken the task at all, and urged a discussion of the subject.—I have not been able to find any of his letters on it, but the following was prepared some time in December 1800, with a view to be sent him in reply.

" I now sit down to state to you my reasons for declining to teach the class, for 100*l.* per annum, instead of 200*l.* which I have had hitherto. When you first made this new proposal, you seemed averse from discussion on the subject, desiring me to judge of it, and adding, that ' I needed only ' to tell you the result.' To this hint, I paid the most scrupulous attention in my reply, both because I was perfectly sensible, that each of us had a right to act according to his own judgement, and because I was well pleased to say nothing on a subject on which we did not agree. I simply stated, therefore, ' that I was not willing to go on as ' at present, on lower terms, than I would have accepted ' at first.'—Since this declaration, however, on my part, you have thought it right to explain to me your reasons, for the offer you have made, and seem desirous of receiving an explanation of mine, for refusing it. You will, of course, be aware, that in giving this explanation, I am not guilty of any intrusion; and while, on that account, I hope for your patient attention, I intreat you not to think, that it is my object to struggle for a good bargain, or, in the most distant manner, to induce you to alter your plan. It will appear, indeed, from what is to follow, that nothing is further from my thoughts.

I shall first state my reasons for the above conclusion, which I announced to you in a former letter, and then make a few observations on what you have written in reply.

Among my reasons for declining your new proposal, I must confess, that one was, a suspicion, that you were not much inclined to employ me any longer as a tutor. When I considered, that you had already found me unwilling to admit of a deduction of 50*l.* a-year, even when you offered to buy my stock of books, and pay for such as might after-

wards be wanted *; I really could not account for your proposing to double the deduction, and yet leave me to support the expence of the library, except upon the supposition, that at least you had no objection to my resignation, especially if I were induced to propose it myself. This suspicion was increased by the recollection that our views had not exactly corresponded as to the mode of educating the class, which has just left me; and, though I might not think you had taken the most pleasant way of intimating your mind, I had no wish to insist upon a further explanation.

Another reason was, that I did not acknowledge the principle on which the proposal itself was alleged to be made; and, at any rate, I was much grieved, that a principle of such a nature had not been brought forward in proper time. You told me, that the terms you had offered at first, and given me hitherto, were too high. Supposing this were granted to be the case, it seemed to me, either that you should have distinctly mentioned it at first, that I might have had an opportunity of judging whether it was right in me to accept of a pecuniary largess; or, if not then, that you should never have mentioned it at all. A man cannot but be mortified when he finds, that instead of earning a salary, as he had been led to suppose, he has been considered as an object of bounty, and no notice given him of his situation, until it has become impossible for him to undo what has been done, however desirous of it, without the most serious inconvenience to himself, as well as the risk of an open rupture with his friend. You could not imagine that it was tacitly understood between us, that I was for a moment to be overpaid. I remember nothing better, in the discussion of our various plans, than the frequent stipulations on my part, which were as often expressly admitted by you, that I should agree to your proposals, not under the notion of accepting personal favours, but, on equal ground, uniting my talents of one kind with your talents of another, in the view of promoting what appeared alike to both, to be the greatest good. After such preliminaries as these, which, I presume, you cannot have forgotten, it is rather with a bad grace, that the principle in question is now brought forward. Considering the difference between our relative situation, when a class was first proposed to me, and

* The fact was, that, in an honorary reward, I did not understand change of terms at all: I would rather have undertaken the task at the beginning, for nothing.

at present; I confess, that in spite of my fondest partiality, it excites within me very disagreeable views of your conduct, when I am told, that what you originally offered me as salary, was what you at the very time considered too high. The story about Mr. Bogue*, of which I pretend not to question the truth, might surely have been mentioned at the first. It cannot be unreasonable to wish, that you had been as explicit then, as now.—When you first threw out the idea, that the terms allowed me for the class were too high, I took little notice of it, because I ascribed the remark, rather to the temporary heat of an unpleasant dispute, which unfortunately was then agitated between us, than to any settled opinion which you could seriously intend to maintain. Since this, however, is not the case, I conceive myself called upon to give my opinion also on the subject. I think the terms have been liberal, but I never did, nor do I yet think them too high. If I did, I should not accept of them: as I do not, I am not willing, under the notion of being paid, to accept of less. I pretend no right to dictate what you ought to give. You made your own terms at first, and you have a perfect title to make them again. On the other hand, I had a perfect right to say, whether I would accept of the terms proposed to me or not, and I am intitled to credit when I assert, that I would not have accepted of lower terms. My experience of the labour and expence attending the undertaking has not changed, but rather confirmed my original sentiments. The allowance given in similar institutions is a very natural and good rule to you, but it does not impose any obligation of compliance upon me. Besides, there is room, even here, for difference of opinion. For instance, Mr. Bogue's salary, (to which you refer,) considering the value of money, when it was fixed, and the stated nature of his employment, seems to me as good, in proportion to the number he teaches, as what I have at present. If the tutors in the Welsh or Hoxton Academies have no other advantage from their situation than 100*l.* a-year, especially if, like me, they incur any expence in it, I can only say, I do not wish for a similar one. I make no doubt, however, that others, probably much better qualified than I am, may be of a different mind; and if you judge it better for the institution, or your duty on any other account, to lower the terms, I have neither right nor inclination to censure your conduct. On

* See page 56.

the other hand, you have no reason to censure mine. I accepted the terms you first proposed to me, I am willing to accept of them still, (that is, if I am *bona fide* allowed to deserve them,) but I am not at all bound to approve of a change. The only case in which I should be really blameworthy would be, if I undertook that task with dissatisfaction, which another might be found to do with eagerness and zeal. When a reduction is to be made in any establishment, it is perhaps a maxim of general prudence, that new people should be employed.

I was still further disposed to give up the class, because I found our ideas so different, as to what was a proper allowance to the students, while with me, and to the preachers, while under the society. If what is proposed to be taken from my salary, were intended to assist in bettering the condition of the students, I should be less hostile to the arrangement. But as things are, the class forms a heavy tax upon a few Christian friends, especially in the place where they reside. The late class must have cost Glasgow a great deal of money indeed, and that given by a few, from a conviction that many of the students could not have otherwise continued at their studies, or gone forth with a decent appearance, to preach the gospel. While money is thus given, it never fails to be accompanied with animadversion. All acknowledge that your plan, viewed as a whole, is liberal and grand; yet the opinion is universal among those who know it more minutely, that it is too much extended, and that more good would be done, as well as in a more creditable way, if the same sums were devoted to the support of a smaller number, or greater sums allowed, if the numbers remain as they are. Now, whether this opinion be correct or not, yet if it be mine, (which you know it has long been,) I am hardly a fit person heartily to carry on, far less to vindicate when attacked, measures of which I do not, more than others, approve. This circumstance has often made me so uneasy, that I reckon it a providential mercy, that I have come under no engagement to teach any more classes than two; and if my allowance had even continued the same, I should have scrupled to go on, without an addition to theirs.

I come now to make a few observations on the reasons you have given for your new proposal.

And, here, what demands my chief attention, is the connection, you wish to establish, between the money I shall

have received for the two first classes, and the money that is offered me for a future one. "I consider (you say) 100*l.* "as the fair sum between us, but I must say, that you "should look upon this as connected with the 600*l.*," (the sum which you observe I shall have received in all when the second class is over) "because books are provided out of "it; possibly you have overlooked this, and viewed them "unconnected; but this, I think, should not be so."—By what kind of reasoning you would support this connection I am truly at a loss to conjecture. How often! have you yourself reminded me, that you never fixed on more classes than two? What connection, then, can exist, between the emoluments of these two, and what, by your own account, was not agreed upon at all? At the end of the second class, you tell me, I shall have received about 600*l.*; may not I, with equal truth, tell you, that you also will then have received all the services for which that sum was promised? Had my salary been 2000*l.* a-year instead of 200*l.* the terms would have, by no means, been too high, (as you allege;) if, besides the duty done at the time, I was thereby laid under an undefined obligation for futurity. I think, you will not say, you gave me the most distant hint, when the terms were specified, that you would expect me to consider them, as enhancing any future allowance, or founding a claim upon me for future services at a lower rate. I have hitherto received that money as, *bona fide*, acknowledged to be my own, without any further views than the stipulated duties of the quarter, which, (as is common in teacher's fees) was paid in advance. The books provided out of it, except those which I agreed to give the students in a present, are, after the two classes have had the use of them, as completely mine, as the food, or clothing, or house-rent provided out of it. You certainly admit this, when, in your letter, you say, "at the end of that time," (viz. the term of attendance of the second class,) "you will "have received about 600*l.*, *notwithstanding which the books* "*purchased, neither belong to me, nor to the institution, but to* "*yourself.*"—If it be possible, however, that, on this point, we can really think differently, I beg that it may be submitted to the arbitration of some common friends. I cannot be satisfied to receive money, in such circumstances as those in which you conceive me to stand. If impartial men, after hearing both sides, shall be of opinion, that the claim in question is reasonable or just, I shall be under the necessity of acknowledging, that I look back with the deepest regret

on the day when I agreed to receive one farthing of that 600*l.* and, while I teach, as I have promised, the second class in the same manner as the first, I shall be under the necessity also of intreating, that no more of that dangerous and insnaring sum may be sent to me. Let me endure, if it must be so, disappointment and loss, but let me not knowingly barter for money, that independence of mind, that liberty of action, which, next to the blessings of the gospel itself, I am bound to contend for, as invaluable and sacred.

Were the reasoning of your letter admissible at all, it might be applied at pleasure without end. On future occasions, the terms might be thought too high, again and again. One-half might, as often, seem the fair price between us, especially as books were provided, the task would be easier, and the allowance, however small, looked upon as connected with the sum total of all the money, which I had received from the beginning. I hope I shall not be thought uncivil, in making these suppositions; for I can truly say, that no frequency of repetition could surprise me more, than the statement which has already been actually made.—Respecting the 10*l.* annually for books, which you have since offered in addition to the 100*l.* I have only to say, that these books could not well belong to the institution, if I were to go on as hitherto, because, in that case, the sum would never be sufficient to pay for the books which I have hitherto given to the students in a present. But it is scarcely proper for me to enter further into particulars. Unless the claim mentioned above were expressly abandoned, and the articles of any future agreement made out, in so explicit a manner, as, if possible, to enable us to see beforehand the whole extent of each others expectations; I must consider it as put out of my power to accept of any terms, however modified, or even improved. I beg that this may be regarded as my final declaration on the business. I make it as in the sight of God, in the simplicity of my heart, without the least desire of giving offence, or rather with the most earnest desire that it may give none. My reason for making it will commend itself to every ingenuous mind. It is this,—that, from what has happened already, I should always have cause to fear, that new light might hereafter be thrown on present transactions, so as to make me repent I had ever had any thing to do with them."

Before I could get this paper copied, and put into the form of a letter, an event occurred in my family, which

completely engaged my attention, and was attended at last with a fatal issue. In this state of things, I threw aside my paper; but being still pressed on the subject in various letters, I seized the first interval in which my mind had the smallest relief from anxiety, to write a short, hasty letter, of which I subjoin a copy.

Glasgow, 5th January, 1801.

My Dear Sir,

I should have answered yours by Mr. Harley sooner, but have been occupied a good deal by Mrs. Ewing's distress. * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * I hope, however, now, that she may yet do well.

I greatly approve of what you say in your letter about forbearance and forgiveness. I say Amen to it all. I beg that every word I have said, or may yet say on the subject of the class, or on any other, may be taken in connection with this declaration. What I would say, at present, is intended to be merely the language of business, not of personal feeling. And I trust I shall be permitted, to state what I can say, as in the presence of God, appears to me to be my duty; without being supposed either to have taken or given offence. Without vindicating, or so much as repeating, any thing disagreeable; without finding any fault with the terms of your proposal (which I have never yet done); I shall confine myself to stating, as you requested at first, the simple result of my most serious consideration of it.

I see it to be my duty to fulfil my present engagement to teach a class, but not to enter with you into a new one. If spared, therefore, I shall do the best I can for the present class, until the term agreed upon for their attendance with me be expired, which will be on the first of December next. Meanwhile, I request that no more money may be sent to me, as salary, except what you consider the fair price betwixt us. I regret that a mistake on this point has existed so long betwixt us, but I do not think myself liable for what is past, because I had not then received the necessary information. The books provided out of the money I shall have received, when the present class leaves me, having by that time answered the whole purpose for which I engaged to provide them, will then fall to be as completely mine, as the food, the clothing, or the house-rent provided out of it.—I acknowledge the obligation I lie under, to devote my life to

useful purposes, and trust I feel it. In giving up the task of teaching a class, therefore, I by no means intend to lessen my usefulness, or to indulge myself in ease. Finally, nothing said above, is to be understood as implying a complaint against you, or a consciousness that any complaint can be made against me. On equal terms I made the agreement: on equal terms I wish to fulfil it. According to the best of that judgement which God has given me, I am following the things that make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another.

I conjure you, my Dear Sir, by all the laws of brotherly love, to let this matter now rest. So far from wishing to thwart you, or in any respect to indulge a refractory temper, I can say with truth, I should dislike such a discussion in any case, but especially with you. It has deprived me of sleep. It has very sensibly affected my health, and my capacity for present duty. Surely, if you knew how unfit I am for trials of this kind, you would acquiesce at once in the propriety of endeavouring to prevent occasions of them.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

I am,

My Dear Sir,

Ever truly yours,

(Signed) Greville Ewing.

Notwithstanding the earnest intreaty of the foregoing letter, and the subsequent affliction in my family, the painful discussion was forced upon me again and again, for a considerable length of time; and although, if I rightly remember, the large paper was never, for the reason I have stated, sent as a letter, yet I thought it right to insert it, as an authentic document of the substance of what I was obliged to repeat, I know not how often, in conversation. In this uncomfortable manner, the attendance of the second class passed away. I consented, for the sake of the students, to an extension of their term for an additional quarter; but I was never permitted to have any peace while they remained, and was particularly distressed by Mr. Haldane insisting that I should receive money, which I suppose he was ashamed to retain, but which I plainly saw he was grudging. I could not help feeling that I was unhandsomely used, yet I was always put on my defence, as if in refusing to go on teach-

ing classes, I had absolutely proposed the commission of a crime.

But the most extraordinary part of Mr. Haldane's conduct to me, respecting the class, remains to be stated. Long after I had given up my charge of it, and another class had been collected at Edinburgh, having occasion to go there for a few weeks in the month of March, 1803, Mr. Haldane desired to speak with me alone, and said he thought that I had not done justice to the classes which I had taught; that I had given them very little instruction, had spent too little time with them every day, had put improper books into their hands, had treated them too much like gentlemen, and had neither fixed their hours of rising in the morning, nor the number of pages they should read every day,—with a great deal more to the same purpose, which I do not now remember. I was quite confounded at this new attack; but I reminded Mr. Haldane, that when I undertook the classes, I engaged to do them only as much justice as I could, consistently with my pastoral duties; that he had all along been perfectly acquainted with my course of instruction; that he had known the hours of meeting; that the catalogue of the library had always been open to him, and that on none of those points had he ever hinted any dissatisfaction; that I thought it very injurious treatment to say nothing to me, while, if I had been convinced of an error, it might have been corrected, and to make a complaint now, when, at any rate, there could be no remedy. I declared I felt perfectly unconscious that any of his charges were well founded. As to my treatment of the students, I said, I had endeavoured to do to them as I would that others should do to me; I had never heard of their being accused of laziness; he had never suggested the propriety of fixing their hours of rising, or of private study; and fixing the number of pages they should read every day, I thought, was a plan highly absurd. Finding he continued to insist, with uncommon heat, on his complaints, I interrupted him with this question: "What can be the meaning, Mr. Haldane, of making these complaints now?" I shall never be able to express my astonishment at his answer.—"Because," said he, "I have been mentioning these things "to some others, and I thought it better to tell you also "myself, than that you should hear it through another "channel." I may not have retained the very words, but this was the very purport. I cannot describe all that followed. I expostulated with him on the injustice of saying

such things to others, before he had said them to myself. But it was in vain. I then asked him, to whom he had mentioned them, that they might also hear what I had to say. With this request he refused to comply, and, when urged on the subject, excused himself by saying, that he could not be sure of remembering all those to whom he had mentioned his sentiments. In short, I found myself bitterly accused and calumniated, and deprived of all means of redress, unless I were to have made the matter a subject of discipline. I willingly confess, that strictly speaking, it was my duty to have done so, on such an occasion. I ought to have taken one or two more with me, and told Mr. Haldane his offence again; and, if that measure did not succeed, I ought afterwards to have told the church in Leith Walk. It was want of faith that prevented me from at least attempting to act in this manner. I sunk under the following discouraging circumstances. From what I now knew of Mr. Haldane, I despaired of making the smallest impression on him by another private conversation. It seemed to me exceedingly difficult to tell an offence to a church, of which I was not myself a member; especially as I believed that the pastor, and, indeed, the church at large, were much under the influence of him who had offended me. My time, likewise, and my mind were too much occupied, at that period, with family distress, to admit of any attempt of this nature. After a residence of a few weeks in Edinburgh, for the sake of medical advice, during which I was, in various ways, used in a very unfriendly manner by Mr. Haldane, and through his influence, as I had reason to believe; duty obliged me to return to Glasgow, without so much as being able to conjecture to what extent the charges against me had been circulated.

Since this was the case, I thought my only way was, to wait patiently for another opportunity, and to commit the vindication of my character to God. The result was much more successful, than my little faith expected, although Mr. Haldane's behaviour was by no means satisfactory. In a letter, dated October 16th, 1804, Edinburgh, (the postscript of which was quoted, page 67,) he concludes in the following words: "I am sensible I did you wrong, in telling "you, that the classes you sent out had not full justice "done them. I think it now my duty to acknowledge this. "But do not answer this, for I would not for a moment

" renew a thought of any improper difference that ever " existed between us, but to make the acknowledgement. " I am,

" My Dear Sir,

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Robert Haldane.

To the best of my recollection, I complied with his request, so far as not to answer this in writing; but I took the first opportunity, when we met, to say, that I hoped he had mentioned his acknowledgement to as many others as, he could remember, had heard his accusation. On this point, however, I got no satisfaction; and to this hour, I know not, but that many are, on the authority of a false accusation by Mr. Haldane, under the impression, that I acted unjustly towards the two classes which I taught, and of course, also towards Mr. Haldane himself.

In his Letters, p. 47, Mr. Haldane says, " I remember " only one occasion when we held some conversations alone, " such as what I have now desired. The result you recollect " was good, and you said at parting, that you did not expect " it would have ended so well." Mr. Haldane has an astonishing turn for treasuring up, and using, as occasion may serve, detached expressions, which, he alleges, were long ago used in conversation. To give the application credibility, he appeals, with the most easy confidence, to recollection. Now I must say, that if he refers to the occasion, of which I am now speaking, I not only have no recollection of the casual detached expression, which he ascribes to me; but I think it is impossible that I could have used it, for I was by no means fully satisfied with the result.

During the conversation just mentioned, Mr. Haldane told me, that he believed he had been led to bring his charges against me, from having entertained sentiments different from mine, respecting the writings of Messrs. Glas and Sandeman, but that now his sentiments corresponded more nearly with mine. After expressing my regret, that dissatisfaction on that one point, should have led to such improper conduct; I said, that I thought the works of Glas and Sandeman might be read by students and preachers with much advantage; that they appeared to me to contain much important criticism; that I approved of their sentiments respecting faith, as far as Dr. Erskine had done in his

Dissertation; that I never approved of many things contained in those books; particularly that I disapproved of the way in which the work of the Holy Spirit, Christian experience, and church government, were treated of; that I detested the spirit in which they were written, which appeared to me very opposite to that of Christ and his apostles; that I thought young men were in great danger of catching that spirit, and of embracing many of the errors in those books, and, therefore, had said all I could to guard the students against that danger; that I nevertheless had put the books into their hands, as I was sure that, among our friends, they would get them to read, at any rate, and it seemed safer that they should get them with proper cautions, than without any thing of this kind, and, perhaps, with unqualified recommendation. I added, that I was happy that he and I should be more of one mind on the subject than formerly, but that, as he had differed from me before, for recommending those books at all, it was possible he might soon differ from me afterwards, for thinking that he recommended them too much.

At this period I date the new views, which Mr. Haldane maintains upon church government. The fact was, that before he had read Glas and Sandeman, he had a great dislike to them; and what he meant by my putting improper books into the hands of the students, was my having the writings of those gentlemen in the library. When the first class after mine, met at Edinburgh, Mr. Haldane not only kept those books out of the library, but laid the students under an express prohibition from reading them. From that moment, they seemed, like the forbidden fruit, to be "good "for food, and pleasant to the eyes, and to be desired to "make one wise." They had never been read by the students before with half so great and general avidity. At last Mr. Haldane was induced to read them himself, and became as much enamoured, as before he had been jealous, of them. The reader is here requested to remark, that the acknowledgement, (scanty and improperly private as it was,) which Mr. Haldane made me respecting the classes, was owing, to no new facts or circumstances which had come to light, but merely to a change in his own opinions. The conclusion is, that if change of opinion be the reason of abandoning a charge; change of opinion may be the reason of making one. Mr. Haldane's friends are, therefore, at the mercy of his changing opinions, for the testimony he may think proper to give, respecting their character.

Before leaving the subject of the classes, I shall advert to the avowal which I have made, in my Statement on Church Government, and in a Memorial published since, on Education for the Ministry of the Gospel, of a change of my sentiments, as to the desirable degree of preparation for the ministry, and as to the propriety of committing this duty to the management of an individual, who is not himself a minister of the gospel. On this subject I produce the following documents, to show, when this change took place, and became known to Mr. Haldane; and whether, while he argued against it, he then viewed it as inferring any obligation on me, to give up the Tabernacle.

Copy of a Memorial concerning a Theological Academy.

NOTHING more directly tends to the progress and prosperity of the gospel, than the multiplication of able preachers; and an eminent blessing seems to be granted to the use of proper means for this purpose. An Academy, supported by a single individual, has, within a few years, been productive of the most important effects, and still promises to be extremely useful. In conjunction with the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home, it has sent forth many, who are employed in preaching through extensive districts, and in distant parts of the world, as well as in our own country; and who have been, in several instances, honoured to gather churches, over which they are now ordained pastors. Churches have also been lately formed, through the instrumentality of ministers and preachers originally belonging to other religious denominations.

For the service of these churches in time to come, and the increase of preachers throughout the world, it is thought adviseable by many of our brethren, that, in addition to the one already on foot, an Academy should be instituted by the churches themselves. The laudable exertions of an individual, and the success that attends them, instead of preventing, should provoke us to imitation in this labour of love, of which the magnitude is daily becoming more apparent. The primary object of the Society is to propagate the gospel: that of the churches to preserve and transmit it to posterity, where it is already known. These objects, indeed, are inseparably connected, and their connection ought never to be forgotten; yet they are so far distinct, as to show, that the

scheme proposed does not interfere with that which has been previously established. At any rate, the field is more than sufficiently wide for the operations of both.

An additional institution of this nature, may possibly enjoy some advantages peculiar to itself. Churches will naturally feel a lively interest in that which they support, and to the benefit of which they are entitled to recommend members. And persons, desirous of devoting their lives to the ministry of the gospel, will feel greater confidence, in expressing their desire to the brethren with whom they are in fellowship, and in depending on their well known friendship for countenance and protection through the course of their studies; than in venturing on an application to a stranger, which must, in many instances, be made from a great distance, and under the unavoidable risk, even after being received, of not finally giving satisfaction.

Such an Academy should be furnished with two tutors at least: a classical and a theological tutor. The first ought to teach elocution and English grammar, a little mathematics and geography, Greek and Hebrew. As the utility of the institution will materially depend on the ability and zeal of this tutor, whose whole time must be devoted to his work, such a liberal endowment should be allotted to his office, as may induce a man of the first qualifications, to undertake the laborious and extensive task. The theological tutor ought to follow up the labours of the classical tutor, by giving some general account of the sciences; teaching the principles of reasoning, of composition, of eloquence, and of biblical criticism; reading with them the Scriptures in the original languages; lecturing on the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures, and on the leading doctrines and duties of Christianity; directing the private reading of the students; and exercising them in the composition and delivery of discourses. As the business of the theological tutor may be, in some measure, rendered consistent with pastoral duties, it may be undertaken by a minister, without any other pecuniary consideration, than may be necessary to defray expences actually incurred. If two ministers be resident in the place where the Academy is fixed, it will be a great improvement on the plan, that both should be united in the labours of the theological department. Distinct provinces may be easily assigned them. Their joint endeavours will enhance the value of the course of instruction; while, by occasionally relieving each other, they may be better able to

attend to other avocations, without suffering the business of the institution to meet with interruption.

The students ought to be members of some one of the churches concerned in the institution. For entering with the classical tutor, it may be sufficient, that they be well instructed in the branches of education which are usually taught in a country school. In a total want of cultivation, none ought to be received.—Those only will be qualified for the theological class, who have previously gone through the classical course, or who, from other opportunities, have received the necessary rudimental instruction in the classical branches. In ordinary cases, the age of students, at their admission, should not exceed thirty; and the period of their studies should not be under three years. Perhaps, indeed, the exact term should be left to experiment of the progress that can be made.

The support of students should form no part of the plan of the institution. Let them be received into it, as persons who support themselves, and who even pay for their education. The fees ought to be moderate, and those for the theological course, entirely devoted to the formation and increase of a library.—Nothing can exceed the generosity of the plan, which embraces the support, as well as the education of those who study for the ministry. But as such a plan is already carried on, there may be some advantage in admitting of a little variety in the one which is proposed. Let it not be understood, then, that the fact of being educated at this seminary implies dependence on the bounty of others. This does not hinder churches or individuals from giving what aid they may think proper, in particular cases. And a small church may obtain help from other churches in bringing forward promising members. On the other hand, the payment, required at the Academy, would call forth individual exertion, and would even gratify an independent mind, which often is remarkably the character of the most ardent students. While the poorest might be supported without hurting their feelings; those in better circumstances would be under no temptation to decline attendance at such an Academy. And the general expence would be considerably diminished.

What might still be necessary to support the institution, would be easily raised by periodical collections throughout the churches. Allowing the classical tutor 200*l.* a-year, the average expence of the whole need not exceed 300*l.*

If this scheme shall be approved of, trustees should be chosen by the churches to carry it into effect. These should consist of the men of best education, among the brethren. Out of them a permanent committee of managers, (most of whom reside on the spot) should be appointed; and their proceedings should be laid, at fixed terms, before a general meeting of the trustees, and perhaps published for the satisfaction of the churches concerned.

These hints are suggested merely as an outline, to call attention to the subject, to obtain the remarks, and to collect the sentiments of our christian brethren.

Copy of a Letter from Mr. Haldane, of no Date, has the Post-Mark of Jan. 26th, 1804.

My Dear Sir,

* As you desired, I communicated your Memorial to some of our friends; it has not yet been returned to me. In a day or two, however, I shall write you.—Of the proposed scheme you must of course judge for yourself; but to us it appears unnecessary in present circumstances, and in some respects hurtful. At any rate, I should think the Memorial would need to be very carefully revised, and that some things had better be omitted. With kindest regards to Mrs. Ewing and family. I am,

My Dear Sir,

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) Robert Haldane.

Copy of a Letter from Mr. Haldane.

Edinburgh, February 16th, 1804.

My Dear Sir,

I have been too long of answering your letter enclosing the Memorial. Indeed I feel considerable reluctance to begin to it now.

As you desired, I communicated your Memorial to Mr. Aikman and my brother, and to Mr. Innes, who happened to be here when it arrived. We have conversed together on the business, and as I formerly said to you, the plan appears to us, in the present state of the churches, unnecessary, and in some respects hurtful.

We deem it *unnecessary*, from the very complete provision, as we apprehend, now made in the seminary here, for the education of all the young men found qualified, who may offer themselves. It appears from some things in the Memorial, that you are not fully acquainted with the manner in which things are now arranged.—You seem to suppose that such as could bear their own expences, would not be welcome. But this is not the case; we should be happy to have as many as possible of that description; and perhaps in the next notice in the Magazine, about the seminary, it may be proper to mention this, and any thing else, that it may appear necessary to explain. My brother informed me, that some time ago, when he saw you, you spoke of some married men who had been refused, and who had never again come forward. It would be improper to judge of so extensive an institution by what may have taken place at its outset, before things were fully arranged; therefore any thing of that kind, that may have happened, cannot be considered a proper criterion of the plan; in which, on the whole, there has certainly been very little fluctuation. In the two last classes, married men continue to be received as others. From the Memorial it would appear, that every thing is managed by me as an individual: but this is not so. The whole is under the joint direction of Mr. Aikman, Mr. Stephens, my brother, and me, and it is fully understood among us, that this is the case. Indeed I esteem it a very great privilege to have their co-operation in all that concerns a business so important. Under the present management, I believe, that the students at the class feel themselves as secure as they would do under any committee chosen by the churches. Nothing can exceed as far as I know, the cordiality, satisfaction, and confidence, with which the students of both classes now go on. Hitherto indeed, we have not been able to get into a method of arranging their time and studies, so complete, as I trust will be attained when next class meets; when, if spared, we shall be able to direct to the most proper branches of study; and from the experience we have gained, to add to, or retrench what the students may be expected to accomplish. As to the length of their studies, we intend to settle that according to their capacities; doing every thing in our power for the general advantage, and furnishing them for their work as completely as possible.—The languages are taught them separately; and Mr. Aikman and Mr. Stephens, in their different departments, pay the greatest attention in instructing

them. As to the necessity there has hitherto been of persons at a distance making application for admission, that is also in a great measure done away by the preparatory classes already begun, or about to be taken up in different parts. Mr. Hamilton teaches one of those in Ireland, Mr. Ballantine another, of all those received north of Aberdeen. A third is about to be begun at Dundee, by his assistant, under Mr. Innes' superintendence. Probably there will also be one at Perth, and perhaps more in other places. As to the permanency of the institution, it does not depend on my life.

The new plan, it appears to us, would in some respects be *hurtful*. I shall only take notice of the great additional burden it would bring upon the churches. In their present state, 300*l.* a-year is a very large sum, which, at least without much cramping their other exertions, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to raise from them. Indeed I suppose, no part of it could be expected, except from the two churches in Glasgow, with, perhaps, some trifling assistance of those in its neighbourhood. Neither at Perth nor Dundee are they in a condition to do any thing toward it, as they do not support themselves; the same is the case with most of the other churches in the North. And it could not be expected that Mr. Aikman and my brother, (Mr. Aikman being tutor here,) would recommend it to the churches in Edinburgh.—Besides, if we are to do any thing considerable in Missionary work, and to continue that assistance * which is necessary for the support of the cause at home, which, as the circle expands, is daily becoming greater, will not all that the united powers of the churches can accomplish be wanted? And would it not be hurtful in such circumstances, to bring upon them so great an additional expence, in supporting two sets of tutors, when one set, if properly ordered, is fully equal to the task of instructing all the students that may offer themselves.

I shall now make some observations on the Memorial. At the outset, I would remark, that if a new seminary be instituted, it ought to be recommended entirely on its own merits, without the most distant allusion to the defects, whether real or supposed, of the present one.—In the first paragraph it is said, "a single individual," in another place, "nothing can exceed, &c." I should wish that I were not at all brought forward. In the 2d par. "the primary object

* To this assistance, Mr. Haldane now objects.

of the society."—These words seem to be improperly introduced at this place; the Memorial had been alluding to the present institution, whose object is certainly to preserve and to transmit, &c. I should think that the greatest part of the 3d par. if not the whole, should be omitted. Were it published, an explanation, or rather a counter-statement would become necessary, than which nothing could be more unpleasant to us all. When it is said, the new institution will enjoy advantages peculiar to itself, it plainly implies that the other does not possess them. But surely churches may recommend to the seminary here, and they may support those they recommend, and, of course, feel a lively interest in them. And persons desiring to devote themselves, may express their wish to their brethren, and may depend on their friendship, during their studies, without the smallest probability, if they be proper characters, (which, I suppose, would also be indispensible in the other case,)of finally failing to give satisfaction. And the preparatory classes, the joint management and direction of Messrs. Aikman, Stephens, and my brother, in whom they will have as much reason to confide as in any committee, will preclude the "unavoidable risk" which would attend the "venturing" on an application to a "stranger." Indeed, if you consider, especially the last part of this paragraph, you will think, I am persuaded, as we do, that it would be very improper to publish it. Par 6th, "would even gratify an independent mind," &c. "while the poorest," &c. "without hurting his feelings." Would not the publication of this sentiment be at least very dangerous? If not bad in itself, it may be greatly abused, and lead many to act on principles positively wrong, some to be sinfully gratified, and others to be sinfully mortified.—When the character of the present institution is well understood, "those in better circumstances will be under no temptation to decline attendance."—

My Dear Sir, I beg you will excuse the freedom of these remarks. To write on this subject has been extremely unpleasant to me, but I have done it at your desire. Let there be neither on this nor on any thing else, any alienation of affection from difference of opinion.—And may the Lord direct to what shall be most for his own glory, and the advancement of his kingdom in the world. * * * * * I am,

My Dear Sir,

Very truly and affectionately yours,

(Signed) Robert Haldane.

Copy of the Answer.

No date marked on it.

My Dear Sir,

I was at A———, when I received yours of February 16th, and have only returned this day. As I have not yet had an opportunity of shewing it to the friends here, who had seen the Memorial, I shall not at present enter on the principal subject of it. As to the Memorial itself, I am confident it is our united wish, that it should be drawn up in the most unexceptionable manner. It was on this account that it was transmitted to you; and I now beg you will be so good as return it, that it may undergo the necessary revision, and be particularly compared with the remarks you have made upon it. I am sorry to find, that, at my desire, you have been led to write on a subject, which you say, is extremely unpleasant to you. I desired you should do so, from a wish, that even the appearance of opposition might be avoided in the proposed plan; and I was encouraged to express that desire, from what I understood to be a message from you, delivered by your brother to me at Falkirk, in return to the verbal communication which I had requested him some time before to make to you, on the subject. The purport of that message, I understood to be, that you had no objection to such an undertaking, and that if you had thought it necessary you would have written me to that effect. You may depend upon it, that when the Memorial is returned, it shall be carefully re-considered, and while we all find it our duty to do all the good we can, each in his own way, I hope with you that we shall let no alienation of affection arise from difference of opinion.

I shall be happy to receive the intended communication respecting Messrs. Maclea and Paterson.

I am much obliged to you for the offer you make of taking 400 copies of my Lecture on Acts xv. But it is by no means nearly completed, even in the scroll, nor do I mean so much as to resolve whether I shall publish or not, till I get a corrected copy finished. If I should publish it, I shall send you a copy, and I think you had better not fix on taking any number for distribution, till you see how you like it.

Mrs. E. joins me in kindest regards to you, Mrs. and Miss H. and in best thanks for your kind invitation to your house.

We have no immediate prospect of being in Edinburgh, and when next there, are under engagement to be with Mr. P———. I am,

My Dear Sir,

Ever truly yours,

(Signed) Greville Ewing.

Copy of a Letter from Mr. Haldane.

Edinburgh, March 3d, 1804.

My Dear Sir,

I would have returned you the Memorial with my last letter, but supposed you had kept a copy of it. Writing on the subject was unpleasant to me, merely because my opinion did not coincide with yours. I was sorry at being obliged to say any thing against what you proposed. I am happy, however, that you sent me the Memorial, and had no doubt when I received it, that you did so from the motives you mention. When my brother first mentioned the business, he did it quite in a general way, and he supposed that in some respects it was different from what it appeared by the Memorial; and I had no idea, at that time, that it involved the expence which from your last it appears to do.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

I am,

My Dear Sir,

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Robert Haldane.

My general principles on Church Government, at the time when Mr. Haldane proposed to me his scheme for the Tabernacles in Scotland, have already been ascertained by the Review, which I have taken from the Missionary Magazine *. That Review also contains evidence of the harmony of sentiment, on that subject, between Mr. James Haldane and me. The first instance, so far as I remember, of my having positive proof of a change in his mind, was when he gave me a perusal of the first copy of his manuscript on Social Worship.

* See above, p. 11.

On that copy I took the liberty of writing some marginal notes; and he can declare, whether I did not express myself, in those notes, precisely to the same effect, as I had done in the above-mentioned Review, and also in my late Attempt on the same subject. He can also declare, whether, in consequence of those notes, he, at that time, ever ventured to say, that I had abandoned the principles on which we had set out. Nor is it to him alone, that these remarks apply. Mr. Robert Haldane also was acquainted with those notes. But at that time he was as silent as his brother, with regard to any alleged change of principle on my part. The charge of apostacy was an after-thought: at least, if it was at that time, meditated, it was not at that time brought forward.

When Mr. James Haldane's view of Social Worship was published, he and his brother were perfectly sensible, that I gave it only partial approbation. Being a publication, I never concealed my opinion of it. But if I could not approve entirely of that book, I was much more displeased with the management of the Missionary Magazine. From the time of my leaving Edinburgh the ostensible Editor had been Mr. John Ritchie. During his labours in that department, much was done under the secret direction of Mr. Robert Haldane. I call it secret direction, because when inquiries were made respecting papers which gave offence, a veil of secrecy was thrown over them, by the influence of Mr. Robert Haldane, even when the Editor might have been explicit in his communications. This remarkably appeared in a Review of a pamphlet of Mr. Innes's, which contained such unwarrantable assertions, that many, (of whom I was one,) thought it a duty to ask after the author, because if he were a member of any of the churches in our communion, we wished to call him to repentance for what we deemed his sin. This attempt at Christian discipline was defeated by Mr. Robert Haldane. He would not suffer the name of the Reviewer, though it was allowed that he was known, to be told. He was also guilty of a breach of confidence towards Mr. Innes. Mr. Innes sent to the Magazine an answer to the Review, with a demand that it should either be returned to him, or inserted without alteration. This answer was inserted in a garbled state, under the direction of Mr. Haldane, one of the illustrations being entirely kept out. This fact, which Mr. Haldane cannot deny, shows the degree of his influence over the Magazine, at that period, and is a specimen of the manner in which he was capable of using it. It was now, that he, and others

patronised by him, began to insert papers subversive of the churches, with which they were still in communion. These papers did not seem to many to be consistent with a continuance in fellowship; it was in vain to think of answering them, when we knew that liberties would be taken with the answers; accordingly we intimated that we should openly disavow the Missionary Magazine, unless it were rescued from the undue influence of Mr. Robert Haldane. This was most explicitly declared to be our object; and with this view, we insisted that nothing should be inserted, to which all our preachers settled in Edinburgh, did not unite in giving their consent. I remember well my telling Mr. James Haldane, that I could not say I should be satisfied, that his consent alone should be sufficient; because I disapproved of some of his views; but the consent of all our preachers settled in Edinburgh, I thought would be satisfactory, and would prevent the rupture which was then threatened. This proposal was agreed to. I know not that the above named preachers ever acted as a committee; but the office of editor of the Missionary Magazine devolved on Mr. Aikman. With this arrangement Mr. Robert Haldane professed his satisfaction, in a letter to me, dated Edinburgh, January 10th, 1806.——" Mr. Aikman has now undertaken to be editor of " the Missionary Magazine, and, I hope, will be enabled to " conduct it to the satisfaction, and for the edification of all " parties concerned; but he seems much discouraged at the " prospect of the labour, and will need all the assistance that " can be given him. I was happy to hear that you had " already contributed a paper. Were it ably supported, and " should it find its way into England, it might be of much " use there. I am,

" My Dear Sir,

" Yours sincerely,

" (Signed) Robert Haldane."

I now come to state what I conceive to be one of the greatest injuries which the churches, in our connection, have received from Mr. Haldane: I mean his clandestine endeavours to win over the students, who, from all parts of the country, were committed to his care, to views of church government, subversive of the churches to which both he and they belonged. These views he at one time avowed in a meeting of the two churches at Edinburgh, on a fast day.

This was at least open. But when he perceived that the disclosure produced an unfavourable impression, he made, at a subsequent meeting, as I was informed, an apology for having introduced them, and said, that though his views were such as he had stated, he had done wrong in having brought them forward, without having previously informed the pastors. It cannot be wondered at, if I do not exactly give his words, as I had them only by report; but of one thing I am certain, viz. that his former address alarmed the churches, and his latter one, in some degree, allayed their alarm; and all the brethren, who heard of the matter, certainly believed, that if Mr. Haldane should think it his duty to promote those views, he would do it, in as open a manner as he had done at first. His conduct, however, was of a very different kind. Without the knowledge and consent of any of the churches, without the knowledge and consent of the ostensible teachers of the class, he privately recommended to the students, schemes completely subversive of the order and government of those churches to which they belonged, and that while he was himself complying, in outward practice, with one of those very churches. These schemes were drawn out in writing, not to be read in the class, but to be put into the hands of every student who happened to call at Mr. Haldane's house. The students were often sent for on purpose to read his papers, and hear him enlarge on them in conversation. Many preachers and pastors of churches in the country were sent for to town, under colour of improving their education. The period of improvement sometimes did not exceed six weeks; and if it be fair to judge of what was taught them by what, in fact, they learned, the improvement consisted much more in those new views, which were privately recommended, than in any thing else. The truth is, that Mr. Haldane's scheme of recommending to churches to choose any of their own number, whom they thought fittest, for their pastors, was so inconsistent with the institution of a class for the ministry at all, that many were at a loss to account for his continuing to support one, till it was perceived, that the students were no longer trained with a view of becoming pastors of churches, if invited to take that office upon them, but encouraged to devote themselves to the new-modelling of churches, and to teach that the pastoral office might, with greater propriety, be committed to others. As an engine of power, the continuance of the classes was perfectly intelligible. The success of Mr. Haldane among

students, who had been accustomed to look up to him as a great and good man, and who depended on him for their education and support, was by no means surprising; especially when all the weight of his talents, information, and favour, was thrown into the scale. Each was privately catechised as to his consent, or his scruples, and as to his opinion of the sentiments of his fellow students; and the more intractable were often got rid of, before the usual term of study was completed. All this was so far from being known, or approved, by the churches, that the manner in which many of the students began to talk, was observed by their brethren with the utmost surprise and displeasure. In Edinburgh it was manifest, for a time, that most of the students had forfeited the confidence of the generality of their brethren in the church, and, being under different influence, they were at no pains to regain it. Some of them, on visiting those churches in the country, from which they had come, refused to hold communion with them. Others, acting with less consistency, followed instructions which they had received, to continue in the communion, as their patron did, and to disseminate their sentiments privately, that they might lead the people on by degrees. Several of them have been ever since, the principal agents in overthrowing the order, which had previously existed in the churches. The success of those, who have introduced this controversy, is far from being proportionally so great in Edinburgh, Glasgow, or any of the larger towns, as in distant and sequestered places of the country, where the people are more simple, and less acquainted with the real state of facts. Inquire into the history of the late changes, which have happened in any of those places, and you will almost invariably find, that it begins with the arrival of some young man from the class; with the visit of some preacher calling himself a brother, but acting as an adversary, to the pastor already in the church; or with the distribution of pamphlets, regarded with general disgust, where the writer's character and misrepresentations were known, but sufficiently imposing on the simple and unwary, as professing to contain purer discoveries than had yet been obtained of divine truth, though the theory they retailed, was manifestly drawn from the writings of Glas and Sandeman.

I am perfectly aware that, here, I shall be attacked in various ways, as I have already been. My statement will be questioned, and I shall be challenged to specify instances,

and to produce proofs. This will be done with the greater boldness, because it is known that I shall be loath to do either, to the certain effect of exposing pastors and churches to the particular resentment of a gentleman, with whom they are generally involved as to pecuniary matters. I can answer, however, with great truth, that I speak of nothing which is not now well known to many. It will also be said, that the influence used with the students, was nothing more than one Christian ought to use with another, for his instruction and improvement. I deny the position, because the students were a trust committed for a particular purpose; and, because the influence being used on them, as long as possible, with studied privacy, was nothing less than a breach of trust. Our confidence has been completely abused, and the pretext has been kept up of aiding and serving us, till advantage has been gained by a stolen march.

After these measures had produced a considerable effect, and were beginning to be inquired into, concealment was no longer possible. Nor was it any longer attempted. Matters were now thought to be prepared for a crisis, and a blow was publicly struck at our existing church order, in a work entitled, "A Treatise on the Elder's Office: showing the "qualifications of Elders, and how the first Churches "obtained them; also their Appointment, Duties, and "Maintenance; the necessity of a Presbytery in every "Church; and Exhortation, and the observance of every "Church Ordinance on the Lord's Day, in order, amongst "other ends, to the obtaining of Elders. By William "Ballantine, Edinburgh, 1807." Every one, who knew our church order, and the manner in which this publication was circulated among our churches, must have felt that it implied a challenge, either to change our whole constitution, or at least to assign publicly our reasons for refusing. It was on this account, that I made my Attempt towards a Statement of the Doctrine of Scripture on some disputed Points, respecting the Constitution, Government, Worship, and Discipline of the Church of Christ, Glasgow, 1807.

In page 208 of that Attempt, I have said, "If there had "been any probability of a publication, to the same purpose, "from another quarter, we should have most gladly declined the "task." Of this sentence, Mr. Haldane says, in his Letters, page 34, "I confess I do not know how to reconcile it with "the fact, that Mr. Aikman had written on the subject, and

" sent his paper to you, and that you, to say the least, did " not encourage him to enlarge or to publish." On reading these words in the printed copy *, being confident that they were the very opposite of truth, and willing, at the same time, to believe that they must have arisen from some mistake, I wrote to Mr. Aikman, to inquire what could be Mr. Haldane's meaning. Mr. Aikman's answer of the 28th February 1809, is in these words: " The insinuation, p. 34, " is most unfounded. Mr. H. knows I adverted to nothing " but exhortation, and that I had not at the time, any idea of " printing, nor was able even to put pen to paper. The " proposal of exhortation was not at that time, nor for six " months after, brought before the church for discussion— " it was merely submitted to consideration."

My publication was occasioned by the Treatise on the Elder's Office, but was not intended to be an answer to it. Since the controversy was forced upon us, I thought it my duty to discuss it, but I wished to do so by an examination of the Scriptures, rather than of that Treatise. I sometimes alluded to it, and in one or two instances quoted it verbatim, with the mark of inverted commas; but my accounts of the tenets, which I disapproved, and of the measures employed to propagate them, were generally taken from my own knowledge of what was actually said and done, which reached much further than what was yet publicly avowed.

I was confirmed in the propriety of following this method, by a conversation of several hours, which, about that time, I had at Glasgow, with Mr. Haldane, whom I, and many, believed to be the real author, and certainly knew to be the great patron, of the Treatise on the Elder's Office. In that conversation, I was much grieved to find, that, when spoken to, on some of the most offensive parts of the book, he neither would vindicate them, nor acknowledge them to be wrong; but answered in general terms, that he did not pledge himself to maintain all that might be said in the book; while, at the same time, it was notorious, that he was circulating it every where, and allowing it to be understood, that he gave it the most zealous and unqualified approbation. It appeared to me, therefore, that his object primarily was the alteration of our existing church constitution, by truth or error, by right or wrong. The maxims by which he

* The written copy of that letter was so much blotted and interlined, that I could very imperfectly understand it.

seemed to me to be animated were,—whatever is, is wrong, or ought to be suspected: change is progress: happen what will, things cannot be worse, but may be better: proposed schemes deserve encouragement, because they are either an improvement in themselves, or the adoption of them, may lead with greater ease to the adoption of others, by breaking present attachments *.

In the above mentioned conversation, I told him my opinion, adding with all the solemnity and earnestness in my power, that I conceived he was now doing as much against the success of the gospel, as ever he had been honoured to do for it. I also went over every topic of the controversy which had been moved, as far as time permitted; told him I was preparing to publish; gave him a pretty full account of my work, and concluded by promising to send him, in a few weeks, a copy. Mr. Haldane also stated his sentiments on several points, at considerable length; and as to my intended publication, I think the substance of his reply was, that he regretted it, because, though it was right that the subjects, of which it treated, should be discussed, he thought my views were calculated to impede the progress of truth.

I shall not attempt, in this place, to give any account of the troubles in the Tabernacle church in Edinburgh, which led to the formation of the church there, of which Mr. Innes is now pastor; although they would greatly illustrate and confirm my opinion of the maxims of Mr. Haldane. I approved the formation of the new church, though I lamented the cause. I accordingly wrote them a letter expressing my approbation, and soon after went to Edinburgh to preach to them. In his Letters, pages 38, 39, Mr. Haldane alleges that I ought not to have done this, without first consulting the church to which I belonged. I am answerable to the church I belong to for my preaching; and for the times and places where I may preach, as much as for every other part of my conduct. If a desire had appeared in the church, therefore, to inquire into my reasons for having preached to the new church in Edinburgh, I should have stated them, to their satisfaction, I trust, long ago. Not a single member, however, ever expressed such a desire; and, as to consulting the church beforehand, in so plain a case, and, with the knowledge I had of their general sentiments, I should have thought it as

* See Statement, pages 213—216.

unnecessary, as I should consulting every week, whether on the ensuing Lord's day, we should retain, or invert, the usual order of our worship. The truth is, it was not, properly speaking, to a new church that I went to preach. The pastor and several of the members had espoused new principles, and were insisting on the introduction of new practices; none of which had been adopted by the churches in Glasgow. On the other hand, the rest had made no change whatever, and the separation was occasioned by their refusing to make any. According to our views, then, I went to Edinburgh to preach to the old church, to which I had been preaching from the beginning. The circumstance of their being obliged to leave their former place of meeting, and to choose another pastor, because they could not approve the changes of their former pastor and brethren, made no alteration in the case. This is my own defence. But I have another answer to make to Mr. Haldane. I say to him, that he cannot be serious in his allegation; that he must have some motive for it, entirely distinct from a principle of conscience; and my reason for speaking so confidently, is this, that though he has been instrumental in forming, and new-modelling, more churches than, perhaps, any individual of the present day, I have never heard, that, in any one instance, he previously consulted the church to which he belonged; and I suppose it will be allowed, that if doing so were a duty at all, it would be the duty of all church members, as well as of a pastor.

In his Letters, page 37, Mr. Haldane says "I informed "you that I recognised the principle, and was reluctantly pre- "vented from acting upon it by the existing circumstances "of the church. I hoped that these would be altered for "the better, and so render that practicable, which was not "so at present." I am not conscious of misrepresenting him, when I say, that his meaning, in this passage, seems to me to be, that he always admits the principle in words, but would act on it only, when he should know beforehand, that it would be no restraint. In this case, then, as in many others, he seems to have one rule for himself, and another for his brethren.—In page 39, he says, respecting the division of the church at Edinburgh, "Should not your "church have sent messengers to the spot, calmly to investi- "gate the matter, and affectionately to remonstrate, if error "was discovered, giving their best advice, joined with their "fervent prayers, and waiting for a season to observe the

"effect?" All this is really very pretty; but unless it were justified by the practice of the writer, I durst not give it any honourable name. His brother and himself are much misrepresented, if they did not manage the division so, as to make it exceedingly difficult for members, of sentiments opposite to theirs, to get an opportunity of speaking; and how then should messengers from other churches have been allowed to remonstrate, or to give their advice? If it were really thought a duty to send messengers to divided churches, would not this be done by the church in Leith Walk? Has it then been done? It will not be said that there is no occasion for it; for the state of by far the greater number of sister churches throughout the country has of late required it, no less than that of the church at Edinburgh. On this plan, I suppose our churches in Glasgow must have had several itinerating companies of messengers continually employed, for the last two or three years.

It is here necessary to say something of the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home. Several of the preachers, whom they employed, had been sent to distant and thinly peopled parts of the country, where the congregations were too small, and poor, to be able to support them. Both preachers and people, however, were encouraged, in various instances, to form a permanent union, because the Society, who sent the preachers, were to assist in supporting them. I by no means say, that the Society committed themselves, by coming under any explicit obligation. But such language was used, as led both preachers and people to believe, that support would not be with-held, while it might really be wanted. Accordingly the Society were in the habit, for some years, of sending small sums, from five to ten pounds perhaps, to poor churches; and it was from their knowledge of this, that a few continued to give donations, and to receive them for the Society, even after they saw many things in the management of it, with which they were displeased. About this period, however, the Secretary wrote to several of these poor churches, to say, that all further assistance was now to be withdrawn; and in some instances (in all, for aught I know) said to men who had been ordained pastors of churches, that if they could not be supported where they were, they might come to Edinburgh, and consult friends there, who would mention some situations which might be tried, in England. This measure

appeared to me to be extremely unchristian, because it disappointed hopes which the authors of it had themselves raised; it was trifling with the union between pastor and people; and it was calculated to force poor churches, whether they thought it right or not, to comply with the new scheme, of having pastors, who supported themselves by worldly business, or of observing ordinances without pastors at all; while the preachers, who had been supported hitherto, were coolly told, they might return to their former employments, which some of them had left for many years; many of them could not practise at all in the places where they had been stationed; and none of them could resume, without manifest disadvantage, both to themselves, and to the churches. This measure, which many of the members of the Society would never have sanctioned, originated, as I believe, with the very gentleman, who, at a former period, had required some of those preachers to subscribe a solemn declaration, that they should abandon all worldly business, and devote their lives wholly to the work of preaching the gospel. The proposal of sending them to England, besides being an unwarrantable dissolution of present connections, appeared to me, to be little better, than a convenient way of sending them to starve, or at least to struggle with the greatest hardships, at a distance from their friends, who might have been more clamorous, if they had witnessed what was endured. I viewed the proposal in this light, because it was an avowed part of the plan, to bear the Preacher's expences to the place where he was destined to go, and when he arrived there, though he might not know one individual, nor have a single letter of recommendation, he was *to be left to Providence*, that is, he was to expect no more support from the friends who had turned him adrift. I am well aware, that some will be ready to assert, that this plan is justified by Apostolic example. I know that Jesus Christ said to his apostles, "provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses." But I am not convinced that any mere man, or any society, is warranted to act as if it were intitled to give similar directions. Jesus had authority to lay such injunctions on his disciples; and power and compassion to protect them from suffering by their obedience. He intended to try their faith, but never to oppress them. For the care with which he provided for them, he afterwards appealed to their experience. "When I sent you without purse, and "scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said,

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

"Nothing." Were a similar question put to many of the preachers, from the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home, I know well, they could not return a similar answer.

I had often expressed very strong disapprobation of this Society, both in conversation and by letter; but now I felt it my duty to have done with it. Besides the disingenuous measure of changing their whole system, while they retained their old name, and did not renounce any of their former declarations to the public; there was a degree of partiality, and practical cruelty in their recent conduct, so much above every thing with which they had been chargeable before, that I was determined to bear a final and decisive testimony against them. The only thing, about which I was uncertain, was, in what capacity I was intitled to address them; for though I had, on one occasion, itinerated for a few days, and sent them a journal, which was published in one of their Reports, and had both made collections for them, and transmitted to them donations, which were sometimes committed to my care; yet as I had never been present at any of their meetings, so far as I remember, except two, at distant periods, and both several years ago; I was not sure whether I was regarded by them as a member or not. Being previously determined to ascertain this point, I expected to have obtained information from the secretary; and having accidentally met him on the street, when I went to Edinburgh last April, "Pray, Mr. Ritchie," said I, "can you inform me, whether "I am considered as a member of the Society for propa- "gating the Gospel at Home?" "Why really," said he, "I "don't know, Sir:—I am not sure:—I suppose so."—"Don't "you know whether my name is in the list of members?"— "I dare say it is."—"Would you be so good as examine, and "let me know?"—"O yes, Sir, but the books are not in my "hands."—In whose hands are they?"—"In our clerk's hands; "but if you wish it, I could send to him, and inquire." I declined giving him that trouble, and, having got the clerk's address, we parted.—The above, if not the very words, is, I am sure, the very substance of our conversation.—After obtaining from the clerk the information I wanted, I sent him my demission in the following terms:

"DEAR SIR,

"I request you, as clerk to the Society "for propagating the gospel at home, to inform them at their "next meeting, that, on account of their partiality, and

" oppression of the poor of the Lord's people, with which " I have long been grieved, but especially of late, I feel it " my duty to decline being any longer a member. I am,

" Dear Sir,

" Sincerely yours,

" Greville Ewing.

" Mr. Wilson, Writer. Edinburgh, 13th April, 1808."

During this visit to Edinburgh, at which I preached to the church, of which Mr. Innes is now pastor, both the Mr. Haldanes, who perfectly knew where I was going to preach, called on me, and I was prevailed on by friends, to return their calls, and to accept an invitation from each of them to dinner. They have since blamed me, I understand, for doing so. I can only say that I did it for the best, in a delicate case; I endeavoured to show that I did not, by accepting an invitation, retract any disapprobation which I had publicly expressed of their measures; I conceived, that the publication of my Statement on disputed points, and my preaching to the expelled church, were measures quite as strong as my letter to Mr. Wilson, and that therefore they were sufficiently aware of my sentiments, when they gave their invitations; I made no concealment of that letter; and I have now to add, that if Mr. Robert Haldane condemned me for dining with him, after writing it, I do not see, with what propriety he afterwards made a call, (which shall be mentioned more particularly in a little) at my house in Glasgow, under the guise of acquaintance and friendship.

I had, at this time, gone to Edinburgh, on a Monday, and Mr. Haldane was early informed, that I must return on the Friday fortnight thereafter. He did not, however, give the smallest hint of a desire to have any particular conversation with me, till the Wednesday immediately preceding my departure, when he must have been very conscious, that if we had entered into a full and fair discussion of our differences, the interval would not have been sufficient to have finished it, although I had even neglected every previous engagement, and the very refreshments of food and sleep.

On the second last day of my stay in town, Mr. Haldane called, and left the following note:

" My Dear Sir,

" I have called but missed you. I wished " to have some conversation before you leave town. I should " be glad if you would either call on me when convenient, " or fix any time for meeting. I am,

" My Dear Sir,

" Yours very sincerely,

" Wednesday. (Signed) Robert Haldane."

I was certain, he could not now intend to admit of any thing like a fair discussion; and, recollecting that he had also asked a conversation with Mr. Wardlaw, (who had preached a little while before me to the same church,) on the very day before his return home, I really looked on the proposal as made, that he might have it to say, he had asked a conversation, rather than, that he might actually obtain it. I was determined, however, to make no objection on this head; and if I had found myself mistaken, the trouble and expence of returning to Edinburgh, should not have prevented a full conversation. One point only I felt it my duty to stipulate; namely, that the meeting should take place in the presence of friends. Foreseeing that such a meeting might be proposed, I had thought much of the importance of this precaution, and consulted several of my friends on the subject, all of whom most cordially approved of it; and I had no notion that Mr. Haldane would have any objection. I, therefore, sent, on the same day, the following answer.

" My Dear Sir,

" I have no objection to consent to your " wish to have some conversation with me, before I leave " town, which I do on Friday morning; but, in present cir- " cumstances, I think it my duty to require, that Messrs. " Aikman, Gibson, and Glover, shall be present, with any " others you may think proper.

" I am truly yours,

" Wednesday. Greville Ewing."

The same afternoon, Mr. Haldane wrote in reply.

" My Dear Sir,

" I have no objections to converse with " you in company with those whom you propose, if it should

" seem to be necessary, after seeing you alone. But before " this, it would surely be proper to meet by ourselves. I " wished, in the first instance, to speak with you concerning " some things in your book. I always thought that we " acted improperly on a former occasion, when, instead of " meeting alone, we began with meeting in the presence of " others. I do not think this is either agreeable to Scripture, " or likely to prove a conciliatory plan.

" I am yours very sincerely,

" (Signed) ROBERT HALDANE."

This answer appeared to me to be a complete confirmation of my former suspicion; namely, that he did not want a meeting, but only to have it to say, that he had proposed one. It was at least manifest, that he wished to avoid such a meeting as might be made the subject of testimony. What he said, he always thought of our conduct, on a former occasion, he had never before hinted to me. Besides, the reference was unfounded in point of fact, for on the occasion alluded to, we had not begun in the presence of others *. The rule of procedure in Matthew xviii. 15—17. to which he alluded, did not apply, for there was no private offence between us. Our difference was on public grounds, and Mr. Haldane had been himself, the cause of that publicity. By various means, and especially by " the Treatise on the Elder's " Office," Mr. Haldane had forced the points of dispute into public notice, and he now acknowledged, that, in the first instance, he wished to speak with me concerning some things in my book. The rule of Scripture, therefore, which respects a private offence committed by one brother against another, had nothing to do with the case in hand. Mr. Haldane was perfectly familiar with the distinction between private and public offences, and I never heard that he denied its propriety. It was remarkable, too, that he had never made a reference to the xviii. of Matthew, till having necessitated a separation of the brethren, whose principles were congenial with mine, there was no longer a church to which, in the last resort, our difference could have been told.—It was from no want of a spirit of conciliation, that I declined a private interview with Mr. Haldane, but from want of confidence, both as to his management of such a conversation, and the

* See page 59.

use he might afterwards endeavour to make of it. The brethren at Edinburgh, who had recently been obliged to withdraw from communion with him, were full of complaints of his conduct in similar cases, and intreated me to act towards him with the utmost caution. I believed their testimony, and have since been confirmed in my belief, by the unfair use, which, as I shall show afterwards, he has made of expressions, which he alleges, I used in private conversations with him. I conceive that I was in the right, therefore, when I thought it unsafe, both for myself, and for the cause, which I felt it my duty to defend, to trust myself again with him alone. The presence of brethren was a thing, to which, I imagined, no man of upright mind could have the least objection. In proposing it, I merely wished to prevent misrepresentation. It was a safe guard equally to both parties. The friends, whom I consulted on the occasion, and who are by no means of a less conciliatory spirit than Mr. Haldane, unanimously approved the measure. The brethren, whom I proposed to bring with me, were men against whom Mr. Haldane made no objection; and I declared my willingness, that he should bring any besides, whom he might choose. In all this, I am conscious, that I did as I would be done by. But even if the rule about private offences had applied to the case, the first step was already taken. Our previous conversation in Glasgow * was entirely on the same points of dispute. In that conversation, we certainly did not come to any agreement. The next meeting, then, required, in every view of the case, the presence of witnesses, as I had proposed.

On these principles, my answer, sent the same night, was the following:

" My Dear Sir,

" My conversation with you alone, took " place when we last met in Glasgow.—I remember no " former occasion on which we *began* with meeting in the " presence of others. We previously had *many* discussions " alone.

" I am truly yours,

" Wednesday Night. Greville Ewing."

* See page 97.

I subjoin a copy of Mr. Haldane's reply, next morning:

"My Dear Sir,

"In answer to your card, which I "received this morning, I can only refer you to mine of "yesterday. I mentioned, that I wished, in the first instance, "to speak with you concerning some things in your book, "which was not published when we last met in Glasgow. "Other things have also occurred since that time.

"I deferred so long proposing this conversation, expecting "every day to meet you on the street, when I intended to "ask you to fix a time for meeting. I did not call on you "on Tuesday, because you was to preach in the evening. "I am,

"Yours very sincerely,

"Thursday Forenoon. (Signed) Robert Haldane."

This note did not seem to me to require an answer. With a disingenuity, of which I have produced several instances, he cannot deny, yet he will not admit, the justness of my correction of his statement, respecting a meeting before friends on a former occasion. My Book, though not published, when we met in Glasgow, contained nothing, which was not then discussed, and that in much stronger language, than I afterwards used in writing. At any rate, if it contained offences, they were now public offences. Other things, which had occurred since, were entirely of the same public nature. His excuses for deferring so long proposing the conversation, were absolutely ridiculous. He expected every day to meet me *on the street!* Did not he know where I lived? Had he not called on me? Had not I called on him, and found him at home? Had not I dined in his house?—I was to preach on the Tuesday evening, but had I not been previously in town for a fortnight?

Before inserting some letters, which passed between the secretary and me, about my letter of demission to the Society, it will serve to prepare my readers more fully to understand their contents, if I introduce a letter from the secretary to one of the preachers, which I had seen just before going to Edinburgh, and with which I was so much struck, that with the preacher's leave I took a copy of it.

Copy of a Letter from Mr. John Ritchie, to Mr. Niel MacGill, Preacher of the Gospel, Easdale, Kintyre.

Edinburgh, 4th February, 1808.

DEAR SIR,

IN addition to what you received in Edinburgh, we send you inclosed 1*l.* In future, however, if the people do not support you, it is necessary that you provide for yourself in some line of honest industry, either by teaching or otherwise. This is requisite for your comfort and independence, and is the proper manner of proceeding, while a church is not able to support those who labour among them. I am,

DEAR SIR,

Yours truly,

(Signed) JOHN RITCHIE.

On reading this letter, the first question I asked was, "What "did you receive in Edinburgh?" to which the answer was, "One Pound." The case was thus. Mr. MacGill having been instrumental in collecting a congregation in Easdale, it was necessary that a house should be procured for their accommodation, and a suitable one being for sale at a moderate price, Mr. MacGill went to Edinburgh, to apply to Christian friends there for assistance to his people in making the purchase. His hopes were founded on Mr. Haldane's former liberality, and on the general practice of the brethren at Edinburgh before that period; nor do I know that any reluctance had appeared even then among the latter. But Mr. MacGill was informed by Mr. Haldane, that he had changed his mind as to the propriety of giving assistance, either by donation, or advancing money on security, for purchasing places of worship. The consequence was, that Mr. MacGill was soon obliged to leave Edinburgh with little or no success, after Mr. Rochead, the treasurer of the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home, had presented him with the above-mentioned one pound. The journey from Edinburgh to Easdale, one of the Western isles, must be very economically managed, indeed, if the expences of it do not amount nearly to the sum of one pound. I supposed, therefore, that I was warranted in considering this valedictory letter, with the inclosed money,

however soon afterwards it might be written, as the sudden dismissal of a man, who had been taken from a former occupation, supported for a time as a student, and encouraged as a preacher, wholly to devote himself to the ministry; and the furnishing of him for "providing for himself in some "line of honest industry, either by teaching or otherwise," with the sum of twenty shillings sterling.—I had done with speaking to Mr. Haldane or Mr. Ritchie on such subjects as this, because I had uniformly found it to be in vain, and the former, who took the direction, had necessitated a separation in church-fellowship. Had he consented to meet me in the presence of friends, however, this case should certainly have been mentioned. But I was under no obligation to keep silence on the conduct of a Society; especially as this letter was an official one, and only a specimen of many, written about the same time. I, therefore, read it, and gave the opinion stated above, to several friends, when I mentioned my determination to withdraw from the Society. Most of those friends had been, or still were members of the Society, though they had no share in the orders recently sent to the preachers. Some of them, I believe, withdrew much about the same time as I did; and whatever may have been their particular modes of doing so, I suppose, they will not contradict me, when I assert, that they and I were entirely of one mind, as to the general procedure of the Society.

The reader is now prepared to understand Mr. Ritchie's correspondence with me. The introduction, among these documents, of letters written and subscribed by Mr. Ritchie, shows whom I believe to be the real author.

Edinburgh, 3d May, 1808.

Dear Sir,

We have received your letter addressed to Mr. Wilson, of the 13th ult. Before you had written such a letter to a Society to which you had belonged for many years, the duty was clear, of personal conversation with the members, and the most deliberate investigation of facts. To this duty you have neglected to attend *. We are grieved at your conduct, whether we consider the accusations you have brought, or the manner in which they are preferred.

* I spoke to all the Members, as far as I had an opportunity, and knew them to be in communion with me; and I found them all of one mind on the subject with myself.

The latter is as exceptionable, as the former are injurious and incapable of proof. We sincerely hope, that for your own sake, you will become sensible of the evil you have done.

We subjoin for your perusal, the copy of a letter, sent, before receipt of yours, to Mr. Robertson of Paisley, in answer to one from him of the 1st instant. I am,

DEAR SIR,

Yours, very truly,

(Signed) JOHN RITCHIE, Secretary.

Before inserting the letter produced by Mr. Ritchie, it is but fair to insert that of Mr. Robertson, to which Mr. Ritchie's letter is an answer.

Copy of a Letter from Mr. Robertson to Mr. Ritchie.

Paisley, April 1st, 1808.

MY DEAR SIR,

ABOUT three weeks ago, Mr. MacGill from Easdale, spent a Lord's day with us, and preached to the Highlanders. By accident I discovered a letter in his possession, signed by you in the character of Secretary to *the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home*, which, together with the other circumstances of his case, has given me much uneasiness. Your letter, which enclosed 1*l.* intimates to him, that the Society can give him no further support, and that if he cannot be supplied by the people, he must attend to some lawful occupation. It appears also, that during eleven months he has been in the Society's service, he has only received for his support from them 12*l.* The people among whom he laboured, understanding him to have been sent and supported by a Society supplied at the public expence, have contributed nothing towards his support. And owing to these circumstances, it appears our dear brother has had to labour under the painful hardship of poverty and exposure to debt, in his endeavours to supply the common wants of nature, out of the narrow pittance which the Society allowed him.

Now, I confess I feel it utterly impossible to reconcile this case with those principles upon which I always understood the Society was supposed to act. I do not question the right of the Society to employ whom they please, and so

long as they shall judge proper; but surely it is not acting charitably to any brother, to thrust him abruptly, and unprovided for, from their care and support. At an earlier period of your proceedings, a given time was always stipulated, when the Society might cease to employ a preacher, and when a preacher might cease to be employed by the Society, and this is no more than what men in common justice expect one from another. But my difficulties respecting the measure of his support, while employed by the Society, are still more serious. At a time when the necessaries of life were procured at an easier rate, three times the sum you have given him, was supposed to be the least, upon which a preacher could be supported, during the same period of time, and the Society always considered themselves bound to make this sure to any employed in their service. Upon this ground, I think the Society is bound in justice, to give this brother such a reasonable allowance for the time he has been employed by them, as will amount to the above, that he may be freed from his present difficulties.

So long as you have given no public intimation of a change in your regulations, you are bound to act by your old rules; and when you change the mode of your procedure, it is a debt that you owe to the public, and to preachers, to intimate this, that the former may know how far your new plans may meet their support, and that the latter may know with what degree of confidence they may engage in your service. You are at liberty to read this letter to the Society, or to make any other use of it you please. Only, I beg you will write me by Mr. Ewing, such an explanation, as will free my mind from the unpleasant feelings which the case produces *.

* Mr. Robertson desires me to say, that he cannot be confident that this copy is verbatim his letter to Mr. Ritchie, as it is possible he might vary a word or two in transcribing; but that he is sure there is not one sentence which admits of being turned into a different meaning, as it contains the substance of all he ever thought or intended to write, though in point of composition it is, perhaps, less accurate than that which was forwarded. He adds, "I did not consider Mr. Ritchie's reply to be satisfactory, because, considering that letter to Mr. MacGill in which Mr. Ritchie intimates, that the Society would no longer support him, as complete evidence that they had given him reason to expect their support, and, judging that he was entitled to a reasonable allowance for meeting his expenditure, while employed in their service, I could not perceive how the circumstance of his having received no appointment to any fixed situation for preaching, could, in the least degree, diminish their obligations to supply his wants. Neither could I understand, how any diminution of that liberality with which Christians

Copy of the Reply.

Edinburgh, April 12th, 1808.

My Dear Sir,

I have received your letter of the 1st instant, and observe what you say of Mr. MacGill. I certainly approve of your solicitude in regard to this business.—On the other hand, I or the Society ought to be ready to give any reasonable explanation of our conduct. The circumstances of the present case, as far as I recollect, are as follows:—When brother Macgill went out from this, he was not appointed to any station. He went out with a view to settle in any place which he might think most eligible, and nothing was said of his continuing any time under the Society, nor was any promise given of future support. Thus there was nothing passed between us which inferred obligation on either side, nor was any inquiry afterwards made where he had gone, or what he had been doing. On examining the books, I find that on April 4th, 1807, when I believe he left Edinburgh, he was paid 5*l.*—August 7th, we remitted to him 5*l.* more.—November 6th, 5*l.*—January 30th, 1808, he received 3*l.* for a coat,—and February 4th, 2*l.*—in all, 20*l* *. This was given merely in the way of assistance, and not in the way of any stipulation, which had never been made.

You speak of churches judging how far it may be proper to support our measures. But I do not at present recollect any assistance for a very long period, that we have received in this way. Indeed the public has done very little for the support of the Society almost from the beginning, as you may be satisfied of, by looking at the covers of the Magazine, especially for some years past. At the same time, we have been careful to fulfil any expectation justly formed, by all with whom we are connected; and if in any instance it could be shown, that through neglect, or by mistake, we had withheld from any person his due, we would, on being convinced of it, most readily make it up.——

I am, &c.

" had been accustomed to support that Society, could form any warrant to " vary the principles of their operation, without giving the same formal " intimation of the change, as they had given of their original establishment. " I did not, however, offer any reply by letter, as I promised myself the " opportunity of a private interview, when I might be able to make an " intended visit to Edinburgh; but upon my arrival there, I found the Society " was dissolved."

* Mr. Ritchie says, in a Note, Mr. Robertson had said in his letter that he had only received 11*l.* Mr. Robertson's copy, however, says 12*l.* as printed above, p. 110.

Before proceeding with the correspondence, we shall stop, for a moment, to balance accompts. In Mr. Ritchie's letter to Mr. MacGill *, when he says, " In addition to what you " received in Edinburgh," I suppose it will be granted, that he means during Mr. MacGill's visit to Edinburgh a few days before, when he had gone there to ask assistance for his people, in purchasing a meeting-house. If this be granted, the only sums, in the statement of Mr. Ritchie's letter to Mr. Robertson, with which Mr. MacGill's story to me can be thought to interfere, are those of January 30th, 1808, 3*l.* for a coat, and February 4th, 2*l.* The reader will please to observe, that Mr. Ritchie's letter to Mr. MacGill † is dated February 4th. But that letter incloses only 1*l.* The reason why the books of the Society contain an entry, on the same day of 2*l.* can be accounted for, I presume, by what Mr. MacGill told me afterwards, that it must include the 1*l.* given him while in Edinburgh, by Mr. Rochead, as well as the 1*l.* sent him by Mr. Ritchie in the letter. This entry, therefore, confirms Mr. MacGill's story to me, and my report of it. I said, and I still say, that the Society gave Mr. MacGill 1*l.* at Edinburgh, and, in a few days, when the first 1*l.* must have been expended, they sent him 1*l.* more in the letter ‡, with an injunction thence-forward, to shift for himself. I said, and I still say, that this was suddenly dismissing a man who had been encouraged to leave his occupation, and devote himself, for a considerable time, wholly to study and preaching, and making him return to his occupation, or seek a new one, under great disadvantages, with the sum of twenty shillings in his pocket. I said, and I still say, that this manner of treating a minister of the gospel was wrong; and I should be glad to know, if there exists among Christians of any denomination, on the face of the earth, a single man, besides the author of Mr. Ritchie's letter, who should be willing to come openly forward, and contradict my opinion.

But the 3*l.* for a coat: was not that sum also given to Mr. MacGill, during his visit to Edinburgh? That circumstance does not materially alter my opinion. Most certainly, however, if I had known it, I should have mentioned it, along with the rest of the case. I should have said, they have sent him to find support, with a new coat on his back, and twenty shillings in his pocket, and I should have felt nearly the same indignation as before. The reason why Mr. MacGill

* See page 108. † Quoted page 108. ‡ Page 108.

did not tell me of the 3*l.* was that he did not understand it to be from the Society, but from Mr. Haldane himself, as patron of the class, who had given the same sum for the same purpose, to each of Mr. MacGill's fellow students, and had been in the habit of doing so to all the students, except those of the first class. In like manner, Mr. Robertson was told that Mr. MacGill had only received 12*l.* because Mr. MacGill did not understand the 5*l.* paid him April 4th 1807, when he left the class, to be from the Society. No man, who knows the Society and the classes, can be surprised at the mistake, if indeed it be a mistake. In the case of the 5*l.* and 3*l.* the money was paid to him by Mr. Haldane, because he had been a student at the class: in the other cases, the money was paid him by the treasurer or secretary, because he was a preacher under the Society. I must say, that I never understood that the expence of the classes was to be found in the books of the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home. I do not believe that it is entered in any printed account of the Society's expenditure. I never knew of any source from which the expence of the classes received any supply, except Mr. Haldane's private liberality, and the surplus of the proceeds of the Tabernacles. I have been told, that the Society could not interfere with the classes, as these were a private concern of Mr. Haldane's. It certainly does, therefore, seem strange to me, that any of the expences of the classes should be found in the books of the Society; and I do think, ground has been given for suspecting that the introduction of these class expences into the books of the Society, has been made with a view to lessen, as much as possible, the odium attached to their illiberal behaviour, and to bring unmerited reproach on those who have reproved them, by attempting to invalidate their faithful testimony.—On this head, however, I assert nothing The chief point in the business is this: Granting that, in the course of the preceding year, Mr. MacGill had got 20*l.*; it was well known to the Society that this 20*l.* must have been spent, however frugal his mode of living, and with all the assistance he had received from any other quarter; and that the people among whom he was labouring, had not understood that they were to support him; it was, therefore, unchristian neglect, (especially as no fault was alleged against him) to order him to find support for himself, with the scanty pittance which the letter inclosed.

It is asserted in Mr. Ritchie's letter to me, that my accusations of the Society "are injurious and incapable of proof." That they must injure the character of the Society is manifest; and for this the Society have themselves to blame; but that they are "incapable of proof," cannot be true, unless we are to set aside, not only the unimpeached testimony of Mr. MacGill, but two letters in the hand-writing of Mr. Ritchie, namely, his letter to Mr. MacGill of February 4th, 1808, and his extract from the books of the Society of an entry of the same date of 2*l.* in his letter to Mr. Robertson, of April 12th, 1808. The writer of these letters could not be ignorant of these proofs. It appeared to me, therefore, to be quite unnecessary to say more, in my answer, than what follows:

DEAR SIR,

WHAT I wrote in my letter to Mr. Wilson, *I know* to be truth, and to that letter I finally refer.—If you are really determined to deny, that I have, a thousand times, had personal conversation on the impropriety of their measures, with the members of the Society, and always to no purpose, I must submit, in this as in many other instances, to be misrepresented; but I beg to be excused from further correspondence on the subject.

I am truly yours,
GREVILLE EWING.

Glasgow, 4th May, 1808.

My hope that the above would have put an end to useless altercation, was vain. I had the trouble of also answering what follows:

Edinburgh, 19th May, 1808.

DEAR SIR,

A LITTLE calm reflection will probably convince you of the impropriety of your letter of the 4th. On the principles of Christianity, a very different answer was due, to the one you received. Had you offered any proof of your assertions, we should have deemed it our duty to have answered you fully.—No reasonable explanation should have been withheld.

Former conversations on the "impropriety of their measures," do not vindicate the manner of preferring the *accusations* contained in your letter, against those to whom, when it was written, you had daily access. Since you have had any other

opportunity for such conversations, your name has at different times appeared in contributions to the Society, the inconsistency of which, had they been similar to your letters, is sufficiently evident.

From the copy of the letter which was sent, you must be sensible, that while in Edinburgh you misrepresented the society. A little inquiry at the members would have corrected this mistake. If you *feel*, because, " in many instances," you have been misrepresented, you should be doubly on your guard against misrepresenting others. I am,

DEAR SIR,

Yours truly,

(Signed) JOHN RITCHIE.

Copy of the Answer.

Glasgow, 21st May, 1808.

DEAR SIR,

My letter of the 4th was not written without calm reflection. On the principles of Christianity, I do not see how I should have written a different answer.—By the expression in my last, with which you seem willing to entangle me, " the impropriety of their measures," I meant nothing different from that " partiality, and oppression of " the poor of the Lord's people," with which I had long been grieved, and on account of the continuance, and late dreadful increase of which, I felt it incumbent on me to withdraw. In withdrawing, I certainly did not feel it necessary to do more, than honestly to state *my own* reasons for *my own* conduct. I could never think of offering proof for that which is both notorious and avowed; nor of asking explanations, where they appeared to me to be utterly unavailing, since no explanation could reconcile my mind to what I conceive to be palpable immoralities. My opinion of the facts is by no means singular. If you think yourself justifiable, publish your official correspondence, and appeal to others. Meanwhile I must use the freedom to act agreeably to my own convictions, and, on all proper occasions, to declare the reasons of my conduct.

You charge me with misrepresenting the Society, as to the case of Mr. MacGill, when I was last in Edinburgh. The charge is false. My representation of that case was a faithful statement of an official letter of your own, of which

I took a copy from the original, that I might avoid mistakes. The copy of your letter to Mr. Robertson on the subject, which you sent me for perusal, proves nothing against my representation; although it makes, indeed, an addition to the melancholy specimens of the mode of *management* which has long prevailed in that Society.—The case of Mr. MacGill is but one of many.—I did not think myself at liberty to refuse to transmit money to the Society, while I was considered a member of it. But I may have been wrong in consenting to do so, as long as I did. A Christian may err, through reluctance to break a connection *.

In my last, I begged to be excused from all further correspondence on the subject of the Society. This favour you have thought it proper to refuse. Were there any reasonable hope of doing you good by continuing the discussion, I would cheerfully consent to it. This, however, does not appear to me to be, at present, the case. I must, therefore, say, that if you write me again, (unless it be in a very different strain from that of your two last letters,) I shall feel it my duty to make no reply. I am,

DEAR SIR,

Truly yours,

GREVILLE EWING.

Here ends my correspondence with the secretary of the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home. But he was quickly ordered to return to the charge, in consequence of which, I yielded him the last word. The concluding letter was in these terms.

Edinburgh, 25th May, 1808.

DEAR SIR,

There can be no satisfaction in prolonging so unpleasant a correspondence as that which you have commenced †.

* I might have added, however, for my vindication, that I do not think I received any money for the Society, after I knew of their general desertion of the preachers and poorer churches; and that, where I had reason to believe my former recommendations of the Society, might have prevailed on the well-disposed to give, or to bequeathe, sums of money towards its support, I was careful duly to announce my subsequent disapprobation.

† I did not commence this correspondence. My letter of the 13th April, addressed to Mr. Wilson, was an absolute demission. The correspondence was begun by Mr. Ritchie in his letter to me, of the 3d of May.

You have brought the most unfounded and unwarrantable accusations against us. You have been called on for proof, or for the grounds on which you supposed them to rest. But with this, which we are confident was due on the principles of Christianity, we have not been favoured. Instead of it you have persisted in general assertions *.

The accusations contained in your letter, were very different from your former representations on the subject †. If they had not been so, it would not only have been inconsistent to have remained a member of the Society, and to have transmitted to it money; but to have had any Christian connection, private or social, with those whom you supposed to be guilty of such practices ‡.

What can you mean by representing the letter, a copy of which was sent you, as a specimen of *management?* You have it in your possession: Read it again with coolness, and impartiality, and you will be convinced, it will bear no such construction. But if you examine the dates and payments contained in it, particularly the two last, you will be compelled to admit that you did misrepresent the Society, in regard to what was given to Mr. M'G. when in Edinburgh ‖.

* How astonishing is it, that such language should be used, when in my immediately preceding letter, I had expressly referred to Mr. Ritchie's own two letters, the one to Mr. MacGill, and the other to Mr. Robertson! Surely they wanted either to provoke me to break my resolution of not answering again; or to use unwarrantable freedom if I determined to keep it.

† Different only in degree, and this was owing to the difference of the degree of severity of which the Society had lately been guilty.

‡ This sentence I understood to be a reflection on me for dining, when last in town, with the two Mr. Haldanes, of which I have spoken page 103.

‖ The Society cannot charge misrepresentation on me in this case, when I told the whole truth, as far as I knew it, and when they made the second last of these payments, the 3*l.* for a coat, to Mr. MacGill in so mysterious a manner, as even to keep him in the dark, respecting the quarter from which it came. He not only did not mention it to me, but did not know that the Society laid any claim to it, till he saw these letters of Mr. Ritchie's. I must add, that to this hour, I suspect, that these expences of the class have been introduced into the books of the Society, for the unworthy purpose of making it seem, as if they had been misrepresented. After all, what is the difference of our stories? I said, they abandoned him with a present of twenty shillings, to set him up in the world. They cannot deny that this was actually their last step; but, say they, you only mentioned a previous payment of another twenty shillings, whereas at a still prior date, he got 3*l.* for a coat. By this kind of reasoning, they might have cavilled at me, for not mentioning all the previous payments made to him. But their own statement does not even pretend that he had, when abandoned by the Society, one single farthing more than I stated, to assist him in commencing busines for his own support. The morality, therefore, of their procedure, is, according to both our stories, exactly the same.

To the declaration contained in the concluding paragraph of that letter we adhere, and whatever reports are either circulated or credited, we defy any one to prove, that since the commencement of the Society, we have not been "careful "to fulfil any expectations, justly formed, by all with whom "we are connected." I am,

DEAR SIR,

Yours truly,

(Signed) JOHN RITCHIE.

IN the above letter, I am asked what I can mean by representing Mr. Ritchie's letter to Mr. Robertson, as a specimen of *management*. I mean, in the first place, the wretched attempt to apologise for deserting a brother, after assisting him for a time, on the plea, that "nothing had passed between "them, which inferred obligation on either side." What would they have said, if, like me, he had possessed a solemn contract which had been made between them? O! still they would have been quite free. "The contract was a worldly, "sinful transaction. We sinned in giving, and you in ac- "cepting it; you must therefore, give it back to us, with all "due repentance, for having permitted us to deceive you." Those who can change their tone, in this manner, will never be hampered by any thing which infers obligation.—I believe that nothing had passed between the Priest or Levite, and the man who fell among thieves, which inferred obligation on either side. The connection between Mr. MacGill and the Society, let them explain it as they will, was a little more particular.

Another specimen of *management* in the letter to Mr. Robertson, is the assertion that "no inquiry was afterwards "made where he (Mr. MacGill) had gone, or what he had "been doing." What! did the Society send him 5*l*. August 7th, and 5*l*. November 6th, without inquiring where he had gone, or what he was doing?—But let me be cautious, lest I misrepresent the Society. Perhaps it may be found, in their books, that they were informed on these points without inquiry, Mr. MacGill having spontaneously written them all his history. This is the only way in which I can account for the assertion; and these things taken together, do appear to me to be a very melancholy specimen of the mode of *management* which has prevailed in the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home.

Many instances, similar to that of Mr. MacGill, and even more flagrant, might have been pointed out; but I avoided doing so, for a very obvious and sufficient reason. I did not wish to expose the sufferers to the additional distress, of experiencing the particular resentment of one, against whom they might be supposed to have complained, and with whom their churches were probably involved, from having accepted advances of money on the security of their places of worship. But the Society can need no information on these points. Let them examine their books: these will tell, which of their deserted preachers, have been longest unaccustomed to worldly business; which of them are furthest advanced in life; which of them are married; and which have the least help from their people, and the largest families to provide for at home.

Could the Society plead poverty for their measures, it would be some excuse. But this they cannot do. It is perfectly true, indeed, as stated in Mr. Ritchie's letter to Mr. Robertson, that "for a very long period the churches "have given the Society no assistance; and that the public "has done very little for its support *almost* from the begin-"ning." But the reason is, that, for a very long period, the churches have not much approved of the Society; and, *almost* from the beginning, the public (though their liberality was very considerable for a time) have had little confidence in it. It was perceived, at an early period, that the plans of an individual must be urged and carried, in preference to those of every one else. It is well known to the original members, that on this single account, many withdrew; or, if they did not formally resign, at least they declined all further attendance, and all further contribution. The public soon perceive who are the active and responsible members of a society. I do not object, universally, to the particular influence of an individual. I have known individuals, who were the life and soul of the societies, to which they belonged. But then their ideas were liberal. Their manners were unassuming. Their management was satisfactory to all parties concerned. But when the richest man in a society will carry his point, though others, who could have effectually co-operated, should disapprove of it, he must expect to bear his burden alone; and if, after finding that he has involved himself in expence, he betake himself to oppressive retrenchments, for diminishing that burden, or to violent and sudden changes of plan (from which the poor must

suffer) in order to get rid of it, or in any other way to please himself;—the emotions of every christian heart will testify against him.

I now come to give an account of a call, which Mr. Haldane made me at my house in Glasgow, on the 8th of June, 1808, when he first made the demand that I should leave the Tabernacle, and when I felt it my duty to turn away from him.

I was out when he called, but he asked for Mrs. Ewing, and sat with her in the drawing-room, where two other friends also were, above half-an-hour, inquiring after my health, and proposing to wait till I should come in, as he wanted to see me. All the while his behaviour was like that of an acquaintance and friend of the family. On coming in, as soon as I heard that Mr. Haldane was up stairs, I went to him. With me also, he preserved the same guise of friendship, shaking hands with me, inquiring after my health, and talking familiarly, for some time, on common subjects. At last he rose and bid us good-morning. I attended him to the door. When we had got to the door, he said, "When would it be convenient for you to take a "walk?—Could you go just now?"—"No, said I, I have to "preach to-night."—"When would it be convenient then; "I was wishing to talk over some things?"—I immediately perceived that he wanted to draw me into a conversation alone, which, for reasons stated above *, I was determined to refuse. I, therefore, answered, "I have already told you, "Mr. Haldane, before whom only I can talk with you."—So little, however, did I dream of what was to follow, that I, for a moment, prevented his reply, by a question intended to enable me to judge, whether, as he had called under the guise of friendship, he expected that I should ask him to dinner. Alluding to the reproach cast upon me in Mr. Ritchie's last letter, for having any private or social connection with those whom I had accused, I said, "By the bye, Sir, "before we go further, I wish to ask, was it with your "knowledge and approbation, that those letters were writ-"ten, which I got lately from Mr. Ritchie?"—"Yes," said he,—"I was very much surprised, indeed, with your con-"duct in that business."—Referring merely to the first word of his answer, I said, "very well;" and remained

* Page 104—106.

silent, being fully sensible, that to give him an invitation, was out of the question.—He then returned to the former subject. "It is about other things than those on which "you declined to converse with me alone at Edinburgh."—"My note, said I, was general; you and I cannot meet "alone." He repeated, "But it is about other things—"things of a personal nature—it is about the house."—"The subject, I replied, can make no difference in my "determination—if you have any thing to say to me, you "will be so good as give it me in writing."—"I say now "then," was his answer, "that as I consider you to have "completely departed from the system on which we set "out, I think you have no right to retain the house," (meaning the Tabernacle.) Surprised as I was by this demand, the first thought that occurred to me was, a false account will be given of this conversation. I, therefore, took no notice of the demand itself, but simply repeated a part of my former answer: "You will be so good as give me this in writing." He said, "No." I said, "Then I will not con-"sider it as communicated at all."—He said, "It is certainly "communicated."—I replied, "I shall not consider it so;" and immediately turned away.

Minute as the above account is, I am very confident of its accuracy, because, being aware of the importance of being able to give an accurate account of such a conversation, I put down the particulars in writing, before five minutes had elapsed, and I have the memorandum now before me. From Mr. Haldane's expression, "it is about "other things than those on which you declined to converse "with me alone at Edinburgh," one would be ready to infer, that the thought of demanding the house had occurred to him, after the time when that conversation at Edinburgh was proposed. It will be seen, however, in the sequel, that he wished to deprive me of it long before that time, and was only watching for a plausible excuse. In the introduction to his Letters, indeed, page 8, he flatly contradicts the above mentioned expression, for he says (in reference to the time I first went to Edinburgh to preach to the church in Bernard's Room), "I called at his lodgings—in order to converse with "him alone, both upon his book, and the manner in which "he was then acting in regard to the churches, which "appeared to me to be in the highest degree disorderly, "*and also on the subject of his possessing the Tabernacle.*"—The time, which he chose, for making this demand, appears to

have been purposely fixed on, to make it the more vexatious both to me and to the congregation; for he knew perfectly well, that the seats had been let, only a few weeks before, for the ensuing twelvemonth; so that, if I had even been willing instantly to comply with his wishes, I must have had much trouble in returning the seat-rents for the time that was still to run; and after all, the congregation would have by no means been indemnified for the loss of their seats, as many of them could not have procured accommodation elsewhere, till the following year. The reader is, therefore, requested particularly to remark, that, independently of every other consideration, I cannot, on account of the letting of the seats, give up the Tabernacle to Mr. Haldane, sooner than the 15th of May, 1809.—His refusal to give me his demand in writing, seemed to me to be an attempt to escape somewhat of the odium of a disgraceful proceeding, and to throw as much of it as possible on me. The measure certainly had this tendency, and was not, for a time, without success. Many of our common friends did not believe my account of the conversation. They said, that I must have misunderstood his meaning; and, indeed, a report that I had misrepresented Mr. Haldane, became so prevalent, that, when at last he did put down his demand in writing, I was thankful to get it, and my first reason for showing his letter of July 29th, 1808, to a few friends was, to produce evidence in support of my own veracity.

It can hardly be necessary to explain my reason for turning away from Mr. Haldane, and declining to have any intercourse with him, till, (if the Lord will,) he shall be brought to repentance. It will be found in 2 Tim. iii. 1—5. If this passage be compared with Rom. i. 29—32. it will be impossible not to be struck with the resemblance of the morality of heathen idolaters, to that of those who give a character to the times, as perilous, to the church. The connection, too, in which the sin of the "truce-breaker" occurs, is remarkably similar in both passages:—"without natural "affection, TRUCE-BREAKERS, false accusers"—:—"cove-"nant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, un-"merciful."—I have only to add, that while I feel it a duty to act as I do, it is a painful duty. I would have acted precisely in the same way, had Mr. Haldane made such a demand, to my knowledge, on Mr. Innes, or on any other in similar circumstances, as I have done, in consequence of his making it on me. When the whole case is, on both sides,

fairly laid before the public, I can have no doubt that every Christian, who shall think of it as I do, will feel himself bound to act in the same way. As for any church, which shall permit such demands to be made, by any of its members, without calling them to repentance, it will appear to me, a matter of very little consequence, what shall be the form of their discipline or worship. In making these observations, I am intitled to credit for acting from love to the character of christianity, and to the soul of Mr. Haldane; for I am supported, as I conceive, by the word of God, and I have ever thought, and often told Mr. Haldane, that his greatest danger arose, from not having his faults laid faithfully before him. He is by no means the first, whom I have thought it necessary to treat in a similar manner. The duty of a Christian, as I understand it, is with the firmest decision to disown a brother, who shall be guilty of indulging in palpable immorality, 1 Cor. v. 11. and, when church fellowship is broken up, it must be done by the individual, to whom the guilt is known.

It will here be expected, that I should take notice of Mr. Haldane's assertion, that I have "completely departed "from the system on which he and I set out." I readily grant, that when Mr. Haldane proposed my occupying the Tabernacle, he did so, in the belief, that we were agreed in principle; and I can truly say, that I accepted his proposal, in the same belief. What our views were, at that time, on church government, has already been shown by the Review, page 11. Our principle was, that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and practice. Mr. Haldane says, that he has adhered to this principle, in all the changes which he has adopted. Let him have full credit for sincerity in this declaration. I also say, that I have adhered to this principle, in all the changes, which I have adopted. Is there any reason, why I should not have full credit for sincerity in this declaration? He says, that I am in error: I say, that he is in error. The question, then, comes to be, is a difference in judgement a good reason for demanding the Tabernacle? Or, in other words, does the propriety of my retaining it depend on my agreeing in opinion with Mr. Haldane, not only when he made me the offer, but in all time coming? This question I answer in the negative, because such a condition was never stated by Mr. Haldane, nor admitted, nor understood by me; nor can it be inferred from the written agreement between us.

Mr. Haldane knows well, that if he had given the smallest hint of such a condition, when he made the proposal, he would not only have met with an immediate refusal, but would have forfeited my esteem, for his inconsistency. As things stood, indeed, it would have been difficult to have conceived a more immodest proposal. Its obvious import must have been this: "I think you are about to withdraw "your subscription from the Westminster Confession of "Faith, and, therefore, I propose that you should come "under an obligation, not only to embrace all my present, "but also to follow all my future opinions: I see you dislike "the control of a Presbytery, and, therefore, I propose you "should submit to that of a Pope."

Mr. Haldane says, the agreement was of a confidential nature, and therefore, I am bound in honour, to give up the house, now that our confidence is broken. I answer, it was a confidential offer on his part, and a confidential acceptance on mine; and if either party was then guilty of imposing on the other, it was very dishonourable indeed; but our written agreement, which was the consequence of that offer and acceptance, was the very reverse of confidence. It was founded in diffidence. The only reason why a writing, of such a nature, or of any nature, is, in any case executed, is, that the parties, though agreed at the time, feel they ought to trust neither themselves, nor each other, thenceforward in the matter. He says, he has made a subsequent discovery, that the transaction was sinful. I answer, let him avail himself of his subsequent discovery, on all subsequent occasions; but it can furnish no pretext for an attempt of a retrospective nature. He says, in making his demand, he is yielding to the dictates of duty. I cannot see how duty can dictate respecting a matter which he has previously put out of his power. —Besides, he does not confine himself to argument, which would be all that could be required by a sense of duty. He very plainly threatens me with trouble in settling the accompts *. "I have already adverted to some things which "the bond puts in my power, and there are others I have "hitherto allowed, in passing your accounts, which were on "my part voluntary."—I have no wish to insist on a subject, so unworthy of us both. Yet I am not left at liberty, on any side. Many of my friends have told me, that not only am I not bound to give up the Tabernacle, but that I cannot do it

* See Letters, page 51, 52.

consistently with my duty to the church and congregation. What then am I to do? Do I injure Mr. Haldane, when I adopt his own words on the very same subject?—"The more "I think of it, the more I am satisfied that your present agree- "ment should stand (written, as you know, after a very full "explanation made long before:")—"the alteration of a so- "lemn contract betwixt you and me, without the consent of "both parties, can never be a proper subject of discussion"— "the contract was deliberately entered into, by mutual con- "sent, which I am willing to stand to,"—"*there is no pro- "priety in one party urging another to depart from a mutual "agreement*, far less have you a right to say that I am unrea- "sonable, because I do not choose to do so, or to adopt the "plan you propose." [See page 59.]

But I have changed. Most certainly I have; yet I have never departed from the system on which we set out, because I have always adhered to the principle of regulating my faith and practice by the sole authority of the word of God. For instance, I have changed my opinion of Mr. Haldane. I have done so, because I adhere to the principle of regulating my opinion, both of persons and things, by the sole authority of the word of God. But had I given him the use of the Tabernacle, in the same way as he gave it me, I should not have thought myself intitled to ask it back, because of this change. It cannot be wondered at, if I judge in a similar manner, as the case stands.

The most plausible ground of complaint against me is, my change on the subject of exhortation. On this subject I shall be the more particular, that great pains have been taken to misrepresent it, and it is even insinuated, that I wished to conceal the fact, although my own publications have made it known. To prevent all suspicion of any wish to soften the matter, I make the following quotations. In the first paper of the Missionary Magazine, after remarking that exhortation was generally subsequent to the preaching of the gospel, and practised by those chiefly, who were stated ministers of the gospel, and were endowed, perhaps, with peculiar gifts for the duty; I add*, "This duty, however, was not regarded as the "exclusive employment of any member of the church. It is "repeatedly enjoined upon all. Heb. iii. 12, 13. 'Take heed, "'brethren, lest there be in any of you, an evil heart of "'unbelief in departing from the living God. But *exhort* "'*one another* daily, while it is called to day; lest any of you

* Page 11, Vol. I.

" ' be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin.' One great " end, indeed, for which Christians were commanded habit- " ually to assemble, was, that they might have stated oppor- " tunities for mutual exhortation, Heb. x. 25. ' not forsaking " ' the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of " ' some is, *but exhorting one another;* and so much the " ' more, as ye see the day approaching." Again, in my Animadversions on Mr. Robertson *, " We are far from " disregarding the advantages of learning. We conceive it, " however, to be the duty of the brethren, not to forsake the " assembling of themselves together, but to exhort one " another, that, besides mutual edification, the gifts bestowed " by the Head of the church may be discovered, exercised, " and approven; that those who have received them may be " set apart to the work of the ministry; and that while they " labour among us, and are over us in the Lord, and admonish " us, we may esteem them very highly in love, for their " work's sake, and be at peace among ourselves.". In this manner I was in the habit of speaking for several years. During all that time, exhortation by the brethren was in our churches, regulated by the pastor, or, in his absence, by some other minister; followed as a social exercise of Christian liberty; and, so far as I know, confined to a week day, when the meeting is not so numerously attended by strangers. Of this, at least, I am perfectly certain, that the necessity of practising it on the Lord's day had not been once named among us. It was to this modest and orderly way, (as I judge,) of practising exhortation, and to it alone, that I referred, in the story about my preaching on a passage in the Hebrews †.

* Page 44.

† As this story has been published, with great triumph, no less than three times, I hope the public will excuse me, for begging them to read a true account of it. In the year 1795, I had spent the week at Yester with my wife, who was then there, on account of illness, and I had that week been told by her uncle, (the physician whom we consulted,) that her illness was likely to prove fatal. As a last resource, he ordered us to the Highlands for goat-whey; and I had come to town to preach on the Lord's day, and to prepare for setting off on our journey during the week. In this situation, I chose for my text, Heb. iii 13. " Exhort one another daily, while it is called, to-day." What led me to speak from it, at that time, was a conviction arising from my own experience, how prone Christians are to neglect the opportunities of mutual edification, which are afforded by the nearest relations of life, and how much they must regret this, when those opportunities appear to be drawing to a close. In the course of my Sermon, I spoke chiefly of private intimacies. I also spoke of occasional intercourse, and of fellowship meetings. And I wished to have spoke of what now is so ridiculous in the eyes of Mr. Haldane, a fellowship meeting on a large scale. I thought, as I still think, that it is

It was unfair, therefore, to represent it, as proving an inconsistency in my conduct. What I then wished for, I have ever since practised and enjoyed: what I oppose now, I would have equally opposed then. I have to say further, that while I spoke of gifts and exhortation, as in the preceding quotations, I never established the practice of exhortation in the church, on the *principle* that every church-member should have the same view of the subject. In the meeting of those friends, whom I called together, in the year 1800, previously to the formation of the church, that I might submit to their consideration what I wished to see adopted, as the order and worship of a Christian church, I expressly stated the same principle for exhortation by the brethren, which I still maintain. After mentioning Heb. iii. 13. and x. 25 I added, that whatever opinion individuals might entertain on the Scriptures commonly quoted as a warrant for such an exercise, it was surely a lawful one, and, (using the very declaration alleged to be a late and a new one on my part) I said it might be considered as a plan for giving all the members of the church the benefit of *a fellowship meeting on a large scale.* For the truth of what I have now stated, I appeal to all then present, many of

a most comfortable and edifying exercise of Christian liberty. I knew many of the congregation would have rejoiced in it, and that few or none would have opposed it; but that the great bar was the authority of the church courts over ministers and congregations. This, as I have often said, was the first time I ever felt restrained, in preaching in the established church; and Mr. Haldane could declare, if he would testify, that when I told the story, I always referred to our actual practice of exhortation on a week day, as all I had formerly wished for. Whether I be right or wrong, therefore, on the subject of exhortation, this story does not prove me inconsistent. I may also complain justly of Mr. Haldane, for an equal want of fidelity and of feeling, for the editions of this story which he has patronised and published. In the first edition, I am *spoken at* in the way which he professes to reckon dishonourable. " A minister, once in the Church of Scotland, when *lecturing through* the epistle " to the Hebrews."—In the Church of Scotland, I never lectured through that epistle; but this mode of telling the story, serves, I confess, to give the next falsehood a stronger colouring—" he was obliged to pass it over."—I never passed over a Scripture, because of my situation, in all my life.—" had he " recollected that he might have called the people to have exhorted one " another in a fellowship meeting, he might have interpreted the passage in " that way."—I did recollect this, and it was all I desired to have done.—" and thus silenced his convictions."—What a charitable representation of this minister's object in interpreting Scripture!—not to do good—that supposition is not to be supposed—it is " to silence his convictions."—Mr. Haldane cannot pretend ignorance as to any of the particulars of this story, for he has heard it from myself, many times, and always in recommendation of the very practice, which he wishes to decry. In the latter editions, he has softened some of the particulars, but still he gives me the wrong text, says I was *lecturing* on it, and, what is worst, *knowingly misapplies the whole.*

whom are still members of the church. The way in which this part of my proposal is described, in the printed Regulations, entirely corresponds with this statement. Mr. Haldane says, I have set aside the first of them; but he is mistaken; for I abide by it to this day. The words are: "Besides the "ordinary worship of the Lord's day, there shall be a church "meeting weekly, (that is, evidently on a week-day,) for the "purposes of social worship, discipline, and mutual edifica-"tion." The idea of crowding all these things into the ordinary worship of the Lord's day, was not, to my knowledge, suggested by one individual, in any of our churches for years after this period.

The principle, then, on which exhortation was adopted in our church, was this, that those who thought it positively enjoined in Scripture, should be satisfied they obeyed Scripture by the proposed practice on a week-day; and that those who did not think it so enjoined, should be willing, on the admission of the lawfulness of the exercise, that a week-day meeting should be so employed. It is well known, that the system on which Mr. Haldane and I set out, had much more of the character of forbearance, than that which he has since adopted. As a proof of this, I may refer, not only to our original principle of exhortation, but also to that of weekly communion. In the meeting above-mentioned, I said that I thought it a duty, and quoted what I conceived to be Scripture evidence for it; but I added, that if all present were not of that opinion, it would satisfy me, if they consented to it as lawful, if they allowed there was no law against it. And one of our reasons for admitting occasional communicants, (a practice, which, I bless God, we have never abandoned,) was, that we wished to receive those whom we believed to be lovers of Christ, whenever they desired it, though they might not feel at liberty to practise weekly communion at all. It was on this principle, that we considered ourselves as in communion with the church at Edinburgh, and that they also acknowledged us, although, at that time, they did not think it their duty to eat the Lord's supper more frequently than once a month, while from the first, we had it once a week.—If then, I "*gave it out*," as Mr. Haldane says, Letters p. 61, on my coming to Glasgow, "that my design was to restore "the brethren to their proper situation, in the churches, from "which they had been displaced," I have NOT at length receded; the brethren are precisely in the situation in which I placed them at the formation of the church; and the book

which I have published, contains the very same principles of forbearance, and contends for the preservation of them, now that they have been attacked by so many of their former adherents. The reader will please to observe, that I am not now arguing on any question as to the merit of this system, I am speaking merely on matter of fact.

When Mr. Haldane and others began to use, what was in them, a new language on the subject of exhortation; when they called the practice of it by the brethren at large, an ordinance of Christ, as much as baptism and the Lord's supper; when they contended, that it not only might form part of the exercises of the Lord's day; but that where it did not, an ordinance of Christ was absolutely neglected; and when their main arguments for these doctrines were drawn from the manner in which I as well as others, had been accustomed to speak of gifts, and the precepts to exhort one another; I conceived it to be a call in Providence to examine those subjects with greater attention than I had hitherto done. If I had found my former views to be just, I trust I should have cheerfully followed them to all their legitimate consequences But the result of a closer examination was, the sentiments which I lately published in my Statement on Church Government, in the Chapters, Of the Gifts of the Primitive Churches, and Of the Worship of a Church; and so far was I from wishing to conceal the change, that one reason of publishing, was to announce it. To these sentiments, after the most serious attention to what has been opposed to them, I still adhere, and, if the Lord will, may perhaps assign some reasons for doing so, in a second edition of that book. At present, however, I merely contend, as Mr. Haldane does, for the right of following Scripture, wherever I conceive it leads me, and that on the principle of adhering to Scripture as the only rule of faith and practice.

Mr. Haldane says, Letters page 60, "I by no means "expected, that we were always to agree in our sentiments "concerning the detail, far less that he should adopt with-"out conviction, any opinions of mine. But I did expect, "and the whole of my proceedings towards him implies it, "that he would continue steady to that principle on which "our agreement proceeded, when I gave him such a proof of "my confidence." I gave Mr. Haldane quite as great a proof of my confidence, as he gave me of his. It would have been well, if he had here explicitly stated the principle, to which he so frequently refers. But he avoids this with

the greatest care. All is ambiguity. " I gave it (the house) " to him as a *reformer*, and as one willing and desirous to " carry on *that plan of reformation on which*, although I was at " first far from comprehending it, and, therefore, am sensible " was often counteracting the design, *I have invariably proceeded* " *to this hour*." If by *a Reformer* he means one willing and desirous to correct what he himself believed to be wrong, I trust he formed an opinion of me, which nothing I have done can overthrow. But if I understand him, he adds that he thought me willing and desirous to carry on a plan, which at first he did not comprehend, which he has often counteracted, but on which he has invariably proceeded. What kind of a plan is this? Certainly I do, neither at first nor at last, comprehend it; of course I may often counteract it; yet if Mr. Haldane's words have any meaning, I may, after all, be invariably proceeding on it. If we may invariably proceed on a plan, of which we often counteract the design, we may invariably proceed on it, while we counteract one another. What I conceive to be Mr. Haldane's real meaning is, that he expected I should always be ready to concur in whatever he thought right at the time. If this be his meaning, I have only to say, I am sorry that I should have appeared to him so destitute of principle, and that he should have acted with so little principle himself.—In the next paragraph, he seems to represent our principle as " the ardent love of impartial " inquiry." In this I will not yield to him or to any man. I have endeavoured " to discourage and repress" error, partiality, artifice, tyranny, injustice. But the motto of my publications is still the same: " We are the friends of truth; " we are the ardent lovers of impartial inquiry; and therefore " wish neither to do nor to say any thing that may have a " tendency to discourage or repress it."

Mr. Haldane says *, " If then it is now demonstrated, that " he never understood, or has not adhered to the principles " on which I gave him the house; that he finds I was de- " ceived in regard to him, when I put it in his power, " although I most readily admit he did not intend to deceive; " will he, after this, take a legal advantage, and retain my " property?" If any thing had here been demonstrated, Mr. Haldane could have explicitly said what it was. But he is not sure whether the thing demonstrated be, that I never understood, or that I have not adhered to, certain principles.

* In his Letters, page 63.

Now, both parts of this alternative cannot be true. I presume, therefore, that Mr. Haldane is conscious he has demonstrated neither. As to my finding, that "he was "deceived in regard to me," when he put the house in my power; I readily admit that if I found this, I ought instantly to give up the house. But I have found that this is impossible. Besides our daily conversations, I have found a Review at the very time, in which my leading principles on church government are stated too plainly to admit the supposition, that Mr. Haldane could be deceived in regard to me, when he put the house in my power. And as to exhortation, he was so far from having any of his present ideas on that subject, at that period, and long after, that had I adopted the scheme of it, which he now pleads for, it would probably have prevented our co-operation. In the spirit of his letter of March 4th, 1800, [page 34.] he would have told me, that my scheme "might be very well calculated for a few serious people, but "was very unfit for exciting general attention."

I observe that Mr. Haldane wishes to fasten on me the charge of concealing my change on the above-mentioned subject, by the manner in which I speak of the question, "Where is the account of the institution of this ordinance?" My words are, "to this question, we confess that we have "never seen, and are unable to give a satisfactory answer." Mr. Haldane affects to understand the words, "we have never "seen," as a pretence on my part, that I had never understood the Scriptures about gifts and exhortation in any other sense than I do now; and, as the quotation stands in his publication, page 61, many of his readers may be led to understand them in the same way. But if compared with the connection in which it occurs, (the only fair way of interpreting a quotation,) it will appear in a moment, that the words "we have "never seen" are limited to the reasonings of those who had moved the recent controversy about exhortation on the Lord's day; reasonings which I had attended to, from the very first time they were used by any in our connection, till the time of writing my book, but "had never seen" them to be satisfactory. Referring distinctly to the existing dispute, the whole passage is as follows: "If, then, it be an ordinance of "Christ, that besides the labours of the Bishop, public ex- "hortation shall be practised by private members of a church; "if this must form part of the exercise of every Lord's day; "if the Bishop must be silent till it be observed; it seems a "reasonable question, Where is the account of the institution

" of this ordinance? To this question, we confess that we " have never seen, and are unable to give a satisfactory " answer *.

When Mr. Haldane speaks of " the extraordinary revolu- " tion that has taken place in my sentiments, since he and I " became acquainted †," he uses language which applies only to himself. An extraordinary revolution in his sentiments, took place as late as the time when he began to study the works of Glas and Sandeman. Even on exhortation, my change of sentiment was occasioned by a controversy of his moving, in consequence of a change of sentiment in him. The whole of our differences on the constitution, government, and discipline of the church of Christ, have originated and remain with him alone. In his late publication, there is an eager desire to multiply the changes on my part, and the design is sufficiently obvious. For instance, through many pages he labours to make it appear, that my sentiments on lay-preaching are as much changed as on exhortation. This is extremely uncandid, because, in the very place where I discuss the latter, I expressly avow the former, and, on the same principle, as he well knows, on which I always avowed it. " In a church, as in any other society, those only have " a right to speak, who have the consent of the society to do " it: elsewhere, any Christian may speak; and if he be not " found to speak what is erroneous, or little to the purpose, " churches should rather encourage, than restrain him." See Statement, page 170, where the connection evidently shows that I speak of lay-preaching.

This principle, on which alone I ever pleaded for lay-preaching, will explain why the sentence, which I quoted in my Statement (page 163) from Mr. Robertson, should bear to me the appearance of a prophecy. I never thought that the liberty of Christians *out* of a church, would lead to disorder *in* a church. Mr. Haldane is guilty of gross misrepresentation when he says, " *the very thing* supposed to be " predicted, *he steadily contemplated*, and *warmly recommended*." Mr. Robertson speaks of " another system, in which any " few individuals may erect themselves into a church, and " mutually administer the ordinances of the gospel to one " another." Mr. Campbell ‡ speaks of " the extraordinary " and unsettled state of the church," and adds, " Nothing

* Statement, page 174. † Letters, page 8.

‡ Whom I quoted in my Animadversions.

" here advanced can justly be understood to combat the " propriety of limiting, for the sake of discipline, the power " of baptising" (of course also of dispensing the Lord's supper) " to fewer hands than that of preaching, when once " a fixed ministry is settled in a church, and regulations are " adopted for its government." I do not believe that Mr. Haldane himself " steadily contemplated," at that time, Mr. Robertson's prediction. If he had, he must have supposed me inconsistent, when I treated it as an unfounded and wild conjecture. It has been shown, however, above, page 37, that he approved of my Animadversions, without any exception on this head. But I need not reason the matter. I have a contradiction of Mr. Haldane's assertion from his own pen. At the foot of page 35, he says, of Mr. Robertson's prediction, that it was " not then fully " comprehended by us, but discerned by others." It is exceedingly unfair in Mr. Haldane to produce my quotations from Campbell against me at all, for he knows that I got the book, while in the hurry of printing my Animadversions, and that I made the extracts without having time carefully to peruse it.

Mr. Haldane seems to talk of our union having been formed upon the principle of adopting whatever views he might think fit to espouse; as if the plan of the Tabernacle had been nothing more than the first step in a course, which in its progress might lead we knew not where. As we are ignorant of futurity, we know not where any thing may lead us; but if Mr. Haldane means to assert, that such a principle was then recognised, I must say, that no representation can be more opposite to the fact. Unless I could suppose him a greater hypocrite, than I have ever heard of, I must believe, that such a principle was not even in his own contemplation. I am sure I speak to the conviction of all his associates at the time, when I say, that at the period of our union, he had not one idea on the subject of separation, further than the enjoyment of uncontrolled liberty in using means for the diffusion of divine truth. His " Address to " the Public" shows, that after some years progress, as it is stiled, he had not advanced one inch towards his present desolating scheme. No man, indeed, could have been more opposed to it than he was, till within the last three or four years. So far from approaching it, he used to warn the class which first met at Edinburgh, (unless I have been misinformed by himself, by the teachers, and by all the

students of whom I have had an opportunity to inquire) against the Glassite scheme of church order. He used to say, that their churches were in a paralyzed state, and to assert that such were the natural fruits of the system. Let these facts be compared with his present conduct. Surely it must be viewed as a revolution: it never can be regarded as a progress. He may say, if he please, it is a revolution for the better: and others, who judge differently, are perfectly entitled to say, it is a revolution for the worse. To call his changes progress, and mine defection, is begging the question at issue between us.

I am answerable to the church for my doctrine, whether changed, or unchanged; and if I disseminate any thing which they think wrong, they may exclude me from their communion. But I am answerable to none upon earth besides. I possess no civil privilege in dependence on my religious opinions. The deed I subscribed with Mr. Haldane, and the accommodation I have in consequence of it, do not render me answerable to him. I would never have subscribed a deed which could have had any such effect. Neither I, therefore, nor those who adhere to my ministry, are justly liable to any inconvenience, on account of changes of opinion. This is fully admitted by Mr. Haldane himself; for one of his arguments against the deed, is*, "if you "should become an Arian or a Socinian, it would infer no "legal forfeiture on your part."

While Mr. Haldane eagerly accuses me of removing the church *in principle* off our original ground as to exhortation; he will not deny, that he has concurred with his brother in removing the church, to which he belongs, *in principle* off their original ground as to the ordinance of baptism; for none but Baptists are now received into the communion, and Mr. Robert Haldane has at last become Baptist himself†. In his Letters, p. 61, Mr. Haldane throws a long sentence into italics, to call the attention of his readers to the enormous fact, that my sentiments are now in several respects contrary to what I formerly published, and that many passages of Scripture have formerly been quoted by me in that very sense which I now oppose. If he will compare the chapter on baptism in his brother's View of Social

* Letters, page 16.

† I mean no reflection on Baptists. Some of my most esteemed friends are of that persuasion. My words merely regard matter of fact.

Worship, with Reasons of a change of Sentiment and Practice on that Subject, he will find that, on this one point, double the number of passages of Scripture have been so quoted and opposed. When my consent was obtained by Mr. Haldane to the Tabernacle scheme, he and his brother were strenuous advocates for infant-baptism, and they continued so for several years. But now they abandon the principles, and refuse the practice. This, I know, they call progress. In point of fact, however, it is a remarkable TERGIVERSATION. I pretend not that this change on the part of Mr. Robert Haldane, forfeits any of the rights which our mutual engagement confers on him; why should a change on my part, be pleaded as forfeiting any of the rights which it confers on me?

But I need not dwell on particulars; Mr. Haldane has concurred with his brother in a general condemnation of the church, of which he was a member, as it existed, when the deed was executed between him and me. His former opinion of it will be seen, in his Address to the Public, page 71. "After some time, a church was formed, of "which at first we had no intention. The gospel continues "to be preached in the Circus to this day, in an earnest and "faithful manner; and I am sure, there is no church where "peaceable and contented submission to the ruling powers, "is more unequivocally and conscientiously enforced. With "respect to the doctrines taught, they are essentially the "same as those contained in the Confession of Faith, and in "the Articles of the Church of England, and preached by "those in the Church of Scotland, denominated evangelical "or gospel ministers. The form of church-government is "what has been called congregational. It is exercised in "the presence of the church itself, by its pastor and church "officers, and with the consent of its members, independent "of any other jurisdiction; a form long known, and acted "upon in England. A strict discipline also is maintained. "The characters of all persons admitted as church members, "are particularly examined, and great numbers have been "rejected, either from ignorance of the gospel, or from not "appearing to maintain a becoming walk and conversation. "Disloyalty, as being one of these things which are contrary "to the express precepts of Scripture, and to the spirit of "christianity, would be a complete disqualification, and "some have been rejected on this very ground. The "church members are exhorted to watch over each other in

" love; if any one be overtaken in a fault, he is reproved, " but if convicted of departing from the faith of the gospel, " of deliberate immorality, or allowed and continued indulg- " ence in sin, he is put away; and restored only upon " credible proofs of repentance. Such regulations, we " believe, to be according to Scripture, and calculated to " promote edification."

What Mr. Haldane now thinks of the same church, will be seen in his brother's Remarks on some Papers in the Missionary Magazine, on the subjects of Association and Discipline, page 6. " Soon after, a church was formed in " Edinburgh, and some separated from the Established " Church in order to join it. In fact it was no separation. " It was merely opening another place for preaching the " gospel, where all regard to '*forms* of external arrange- " ' ment' was represented as bigotry, and where the pastor, " and many of the members, showed their catholic spirit by " going to the sacrament in the Established Church. Add " to this, that the preaching was almost entirely addressed " to the people of the world. The members, being already " converted, there was no danger of them, and the precious " hours were not to be occupied in exhorting and teaching " them, which might be so much more profitably employed " in calling sinners to repentance. This is not exaggeration; " it is a true account of the principles on which the church " at the Circus acted for some time *."

* This statement appears to me to be a melancholy example of the manner in which change of principle tempts men to deviate even as to matter of fact. —" The preaching was almost entirely addressed to the people of the world." —I have often preached in the Circus. I know I come short in every thing; but I should be withholding the truth, if I did not assert, that, in every sermon, then, and ever since I was a preacher, I have, as I was enabled, addressed my preaching to Christians as well as to the people of the world. I am sure every other preacher, who preached in the Circus at Edinburgh, except Mr. J. Haldane, will bear a similar testimony. Neither did I ever perceive that he was himself deficient, at that period, in addressing Christians. The truth is, that very particular attention was paid to them. A sermon before breakfast in summer was, for a time, instituted, in which they chiefly were addressed; and such was the general effect of the preaching in the Circus, that the great complaint was, that we were not converting sinners, but merely leading people, who already believed, from their former connections.—" The " members, being already converted, there was no danger of them."—" And the " precious hours were not to be occupied in exhorting and teaching them."— Alas, alas! if these, which Mr. Haldane now represents, as the understood maxims on which the church was then conducted, had been so much as breathed by him in a whisper, he would have found himself most seriously called to account.

On the whole, I am persuaded, that it is not because I have changed, but because I have refused to change, and have faithfully testified against changes which my conscience condemns, that Mr. Haldane has been guilty of attempting to violate our mutual engagement. Had I sailed with wind and tide, and called for plurality of elders, and public discipline, with all the other improvements, as they are thought, which have successively appeared, there would never have been a word about the sinfulness of the deed. I shall produce further evidence for this assertion in a little. At present I shall only add, that although the case had not been mine, I should have thought it disgraceful in those, who have been labouring for years, to produce such a number of changes, by means of which, they have forced out of their immediate communion, as many as form two distinct churches, and have agitated all the sister churches in the kingdom; to endeavour, at the same time, to bring others into trouble on any pretext of such a nature.

When I told some friends the demand which Mr. Haldane had made on me, they said, I should take the opinion of counsel on the validity of our contract; and with this advice I thought it right to comply. At this step Mr. Haldane professes to have been surprised, but he had no reason for surprise. Conscious that he had made on me a demand, which was equally unjust and unexpected, he could not wonder, if I suspected that the paper must contain some flaw, of which I was not aware, but of which he might know he could avail himself to enforce his demand. This was my suspicion, and this suspicion it was immediately necessary to remove. Before determining whether I should retain possession of the house or not, it was proper to ascertain whether I had a *right* to deliberate on the question at all. This I could not do, either to my own satisfaction, or to that of others, whose interests must be affected by the decision, without taking the step I did. In any similar case I would do the same again, and advise others to follow the example. If Paul felt warranted to plead his civil rights when he knew them;, it must be equally warrantable, to inquire at those who can give information, when suspicion arises concerning their validity. My right to the Tabernacle is a civil right, although it was given for a religious purpose. It is impossible for any individual, or any society, to have a right to a house at all, whatever be the purpose, unless it be a civil right.—The lawyers well know, that Mr. Haldane

has no objection to take legal advice, when his own interests are concerned; nor even to go to law with his neighbours, when he thinks he can lawfully resist their claims. I fully believe, that his only reason for not going to law with me, if indeed he shall abstain from it, is the conviction that the cause would be given against him, and probably with expences. The reader will please to observe, that my consultation of a lawyer, was not going to law, but merely a necessary inquiry into my actual situation. Mr. Haldane, however, first brings me into unprecedented circumstances; and then misinterprets every action, and wrests every word, on which he imagines he can by any means fasten, in order to injure my character, and to deprive me, not merely of his house, but of my usefulness in the ministry, and of the esteem and affection of my Christian friends.

On the 13th of June I went to Edinburgh to obtain the opinion of counsel. In his Letters, page 62, Mr. Haldane tells us what he has heard of my consultation on this occasion. A true account will be found in the two following documents:

Copy of a Memorial for Mr. Greville Ewing, Minister of the Tabernacle, Glasgow—for the opinion of Counsel.

In the year 1799, after various conversations with Mr. Robert Haldane, the Memorialist agreed to go to Glasgow to open a place of worship, with which Mr. Haldane agreed to furnish him, for the purpose of preaching and dispensing ordinances. Mr. Haldane accordingly gave him a tack, (dated 8th of July, 1799,) of a house then called the Circus, since the Tabernacle, and situated in Jamaica-Street, Glasgow, with certain conditions specified, which tack is herewith produced *.

As the duty in this place of worship was laborious, the Memorialist found it necessary to employ an Assistant. On the 2d of November, 1801, the Memorialist obtained leave of Mr. Haldane to pay his Assistant out of the funds of the house, a salary not exceeding 100*l.* per annum; and Mr. Haldane's letter, of the above date, giving this leave, is herewith produced †.

* See page 21. † See page 66.

Agreeably to the above mentioned tack and letter, the Memorialist has implemented his engagement with Mr. Haldane to the best of his judgement; and the accompts have been regularly doquetted and settled annually by the parties. The last account, from Whitsunday 1806 to Whitsunday 1807, is herewith produced *, as a specimen of all the preceding ones; and the balance, when any remained, was always paid over to Mr. Haldane.

The Memorialist has carried on the worship of the Tabernacle uniformly upon the same plan, and is not conscious of any deviation in doctrine, discipline, or form of worship, since the church, which assembles in that house, was collected.

But, last week, Mr. Robert Haldane called at the Memorialist's house in Glasgow, and said to him, that as he considered him as having completely departed from the system on which the parties (that is, Mr. Haldane and the Memorialist) had set out, he thought the Memorialist had no right to retain the house (meaning the Tabernacle). The Memorialist requested Mr. Haldane to give him this communication in writing, which Mr. Haldane refused to do.

The Memorialist has no conception what the "departure" above alleged, can refer to, unless it be to various changes of religious opinion and practice made by Mr. Haldane himself, and others in communion with him at Edinburgh and elsewhere, of which the Memorialist never dreamed when the above agreement was made between Mr. Haldane and him, and which he has not seen it his duty to approve.

Counsel will please observe, that the original agreement, as expressed in the tack, was upon the broad basis of preaching the gospel and dispensing ordinances, without adhering to any system as a standard, or admitting any principle, but that of acknowledging the Holy Scriptures, as the only rule of faith and obedience.

Counsel is requested to give an answer in writing, to the following queries, with any other observations that may occur to himself:

First, Under these circumstances, is this a good and legal tack? and is the Memorialist entitled to hold it, as hitherto, for the purposes therein expressed?

Secondly, If the Memorialist be entitled to hold it, what are the proper steps for him to take, if any attempt be made to reduce it?

* See the accompts.

Thirdly, Is Mr. Robert Haldane entitled to take the surplus funds and to apply them to the education of young men for the ministry, according to his own ideas, without the consent of the other parties?

13th June, 1808.

Copy of Answers to Memorial, and Queries for Mr. Greville Ewing, Minister of the Tabernacle, Glasgow.

To 1st Query, I am of opinion that the deed here referred to is a good and valid tack or contract, under which the Memorialist is entitled to hold possession of the subject thereby let, as hitherto, for the purposes therein mentioned; and I conceive that any difference of opinion between the Memorialist and Mr. Haldane, if such has happened, is no sufficient ground for depriving the Memorialist of the benefit of the tack, and more especially if the change of opinion, is on the part of Mr. Haldane, and the Memorialist's congregation or a great majority of them remain satisfied.

2d, If any attempt shall be made to reduce the tack or remove the Memorialist from the possession of the subject let, he must of course defend against any such action of reduction or removing.

3d, As the tack or contract between the Memorialist and Mr. Haldane, provides that the surplus here mentioned should be accounted for and paid not to Mr. Haldane alone, but to him and other three persons therein mentioned, to be by them applied for training up young men to the ministry of the gospel, I incline to think that Mr. Haldane is not entitled to have the sole direction and disposal of this surplus, if the other persons named shall insist that it shall be accounted for to all the four nominees, and applied as they or a majority of them shall direct for the purpose mentioned in the deed.

(Signed) MAT. ROSS.

Queen-Street, 14th June, 1808.

Mr. Haldane's letter of June 13th, which is inserted at page 11, of his late publication, followed me to Edinburgh. This letter appears to me an excellent illustration of the difference between the merits of a thing, when taken by itself, and when taken in connection with its actual circumstances. Viewing this letter as every stranger must do, what can be more faithful, meek, condescending, scriptural,

solemn, conciliatory? It stands as an ornament to the whole publication. I confess that the circumstances, in which it was written, made it appear to me in a very different light. I had not refused to restore Mr. Haldane his house. My only answer was, the moderate request, that he would give me his communication in writing. The most worthless tenant, I should suppose, on any part of his property would, in a similar situation, expect a regular notice to quit. Although Mr. Haldane had refused this in conversation, when the request was perhaps unexpected, one would have imagined, that he might have seen its reasonableness on after reflection, especially as he was going to write me at any rate. Considering the gentle reproof, the kind proposal, the candid explanation, the serious admonitions, and the never failing readiness with which I am assured that I shall be received again into the path of duty; I do think, that no little care must have been taken to avoid the most distant allusion to the occasion on which the letter was written. I beg my readers will do me the favour to peruse it again. It is, indeed, a masterly performance! But it resembles the form of a Will, before the blanks are filled up. It might fitly hold a place in such a book as "The Complete Letter-Writer," to be copied and appropriated by any Christian, in any case whatever, in which, from a fellow Christian, he had received offence. I had not looked at this studied want of precision five minutes, when I said, this letter is written not for me, but for the perusal of strangers; and, from that moment, I have never ceased to expect all the degrees of circulation which it has successively obtained. These are no evil surmisings. The relative situation of the parties is completely decisive as to the merits of this plausible letter. If I had reason to be offended by the demand, which Mr. Haldane had made, how much more, when I saw him, in the very act of injustice, personating, with so much calmness, and sanctity of manner, the character of the injured.

As Mr. Innes is the only other person, so far as I know, who made the same agreement, that I did, with Mr. Haldane, I think it of consequence to show what were his sentiments on Mr. Haldane's demand, when he first heard of it.

My Dear Brother,

I cannot think of losing a post in acknowledging your letter of last night. I was never, in my life, more confounded than when I received by a letter, in

the end of the week, an account of the business on which you had come to Edinburgh. I got the letter on Sabbath morning, and it quite unhinged me. Not that I thought you had any thing to fear, and still less, I can say, did I feel any concern, lest a similar proposition should be made to myself. But I felt concerned, from reflecting on the dreadful handle, which such a business, when it became public, would give to the enemies of the gospel to speak reproachfully. It is impossible to calculate the degree in which it will tend to harden the careless, and to make those who were hostile to Mr. Haldane's plans triumph.—I lost no time in writing Mr. Haldane to express my astonishment at what I had heard, asking if it was ever understood, that the tenure by which we held these houses, was acquiescing in every change of sentiment he might experience, and begging for my own satisfaction his own explanation of a business which appeared to me so unaccountable.—I have, of course, as yet got no answer, as I understand he did not return to Edinburgh, as was expected, the end of the week, I could not hear from him so soon.—I have no doubt that our tacks give us a complete legal title to our houses, during the time we may choose to continue to occupy them as places of worship; and respecting giving up your claim, I should certainly think you ought not to form any hasty resolution upon that subject.

I am happy in entertaining the prospect, (God willing,) of having the pleasure of seeing you some weeks hence, and of our being able to converse over a variety of topics in these turbulent times.———May we be spared to meet in comfort, and contribute to one another's direction and encouragement in these perplexing times. I for my own part feel much the need of that stimulus, which arises from the conversation of a brother, in whom, amidst so many changes, I can feel full confidence, and to none I am sure can I apply this more fully, my dear Greville, than to yourself. I ever am,

Yours faithfully and affectionately,

Dundee, June 22d. (Signed) William Innes.

As Mr. Haldane's next letters, avow at last the demand of the house, it may be proper to mention, that I did not answer them on the same principle, on which I turned away from him, after he made the demand in words. I had offered to meet him before Christian friends, and this I am willing to do at any time. But neither in word nor

writing, do I think it my duty, or my safety, to hold any direct intercourse with him, of a private nature, till he repent of the gross immorality of which he must be conscious. In case a meeting should take place, and for the use of a few confidential friends, whom I felt it my duty to consult on a business in which I was not alone concerned; I wrote some memorandums in reply to the first of this series of letters, which is dated the 29th of July, 1808. But when I found that I was to get one every fortnight, of the same description, and about as long as a newspaper, I gave up the task, till I should see the extent of it. The last of the letters to me is dated November 15th. On December 12th I was informed, that Mr. Haldane had given copies of the collection to Mr. James Jackson, Druggist in Glasgow, with instructions to hand them about among members of the churches, and others who might take the trouble to read them. These letters have at last, appeared partially in print.

Respecting this twofold circulation of these letters, I have to state two facts, which prove to my conviction, that Mr. Haldane wishes to mislead his readers, as to the real state of the question between us. The first fact is, that when the letters were shown by Mr. Jackson, a copy of what Mr. Haldane calls the bond, to which they so continually refer, was not shown along with them. I do not say, that it was withheld in every case; but I know that it was not shown in cases, in which the readers were well entitled to have seen it, and well able to have judged of its merits; and I have heard from good authority, that it was very little shown at all. Now, I suppose, every reader will grant, that if there had been an upright intention, to enable others really to judge in the matter, the thing spoken against, would have been produced, as well as the things said against it.

The other fact is, that though the deed is produced now, the letters are not fully published. There are two chasms in them, which, as will be seen, materially affect the character of the writer, and are necessary to show the manner in which I have been treated in the business *. There are also certain letters addressed to Mr. Harley, which ought to have been produced along with the letters to me, because they also materially affect the character of the writer, and are

* In this publication, wherever I give only extracts of Letters, the parts omitted have no reference at all to the subject, on account of which the extracts are given.

necessary to show the manner in which both Mr. Harley and I have been treated. The omission of the letters to Mr. Harley is aggravated by two circumstances. The first is, that one, if not all, of them appeared in the collection when circulated by Mr. Jackson at Glasgow. The second is, that in pages 32 and 33, dark insinuations are thrown out against Mr. Harley, of which justice to him required the full explanation. I must, therefore, take the trouble, of not only answering Mr. Haldane, but even acting as his publisher, and that in a work which, as I cannot sell it so cheap, or afford to give it so liberally away, as he can do his, may never get into equal circulation. On these grounds I submit to my readers, that Mr. Haldane seeks to excite prejudice, and to obtain an unfair advantage over me, in a public discussion, which, by refusing to meet me before common friends, himself has provoked.

Many of the remarks, which I originally made on the first long letter, (July 29th page 12,) have been anticipated in the preceding pages, and, in those which follow, I shall occasionally allude to other parts of his publication.—In this letter, Mr. Haldane places his demand of the house on a new ground. Independently of the charge, that I have departed from the system on which we had set out, he now says that the plan of our co-operation was sinful; that the manner of confirming it by a stamped bond, was also sinful; that my possession of the house, gives me an improper power over the church; that he feels it his duty to endeavour to convince me of my sin; and to profess repentance for his own; and, by a peculiar mode of evidencing repentance, he comes forward with a proposal, not to make, but to get, restitution; as the uniform inference is, give me the house.

Before any reasoning on these topics, I shall mention three facts which hinder me from imagining, that Mr. Haldane is in the least degree serious when he alleges scruples of conscience in this business. The first is, that on the very day on which he demanded the Tabernacle, he went straight from my house to Mr. Harley's ware-room, to get the annual accompt, and, in a few days after, he settled it in the usual manner, receiving, as the accompt will show, 51*l.* 16*s.* 0¾*d.* of the surplus of funds, which, if he felt the scruples he alleges, he must have looked on as raised in a sinful way.—The second is, that his plan of co-operation with Mr. Innes, and his manner of confirming it, were precisely the same as with me; yet he made no demand from him of the Tabernacle

at Dundee, nor expressed to him the smallest uneasiness on the subject. Mr. Innes had not, at that time, got his invitation to Edinburgh, far less could it then be foreseen whether he would accept of it. It can be no apology that Mr. Innes's sentiments might be thought more congenial than mine with those of Mr. Haldane. The sinful principle of co-operation, the "carnal instrument," the temptations arising from it, the guilt under which the person retaining such an instrument for a single day was laid, were all the same. Mr. Innes too had acted the very same part, as I did, towards the brethren, who meet in Bernard's room.—The third fact is, that Mr. Robert Haldane has the very same kind of power over the church, which meets in the Tabernacle at Edinburgh, which my possession of the Tabernacle in Glasgow can be supposed to give me over the church which meets in it. He will never think of saying that a power, which is improper in a pastor, may be proper in any of the other members; or that possession by a proprietor would sanctify a power, which is profane if resulting from possession in virtue of a voluntary contract. If, then, the temptations, to which a church is exposed, of following the possessor of the house it meets in, be so great, why does Mr. Haldane avail himself of this very means of influencing those, who hold their place in the Edinburgh Tabernacle merely at his pleasure? Why does he not remove this temptation out of the way? He tells me, it is the duty of a church to provide for themselves. It is, consequently, their sin if they do not. Why then does he countenance a church, which, according to this view, is living in sin, and showing no disposition to renounce it? Their present agreement with him in sentiment, makes no difference. Either Mr. Haldane must make over the Edinburgh Tabernacle to the Church, upon their satisfying him for its value, (for no church is considered by him as entitled to a gift of this kind, and it would be, in his opinion, a sinful alienation of his talents;) or he must renounce fellowship with a people, who are regardless of that first principle, as he says, of moral obligation, providing for themselves. The case is particularly strong, as to the church in the Tabernacle of Edinburgh, if their possession of the house be without their paying for seats, making collections at the door, or in some other way, reimbursing the proprietor. Whether Mr. Haldane has begun to urge these things on his brethren I do not know. If he has, it is but lately. Perhaps he is willing, fully to recognise my argument, and hopes his brethren will take the

hint, to which it gives birth.—Meanwhile, these three facts, which I have mentioned, hinder me from imagining that Mr. Haldane labours under any scruples of conscience in this business.

At the same time, I readily admit, that if his arguments be valid, no question about his sincerity can evade the force of his reasoning.—He pleads, that "the manner in which he "put the Tabernacle into my hands, was an unwise step." Perhaps, it was as unwise in me, to take it into my hands, in such a manner, and from such a man. I have been already, and may be much more hereafter, a sufferer from that step. The proof, which he gave me of his confidence, has not cost him so much, as the proof which I gave him of mine has cost me. If we have been foolish, we may regret our folly, and profit in all time coming, by our dear-bought experience. But neither of us can singly require, that the other should, without conviction, consent to repair his neighbour's damages for the past. Mr. Haldane pleads "his inexperience." With equal reason may I plead mine. I took no advantage of his inexperience, and great affliction and loss have I sustained, and am still likely to sustain, by my own. He admits, "that the "idea of putting the house into my possession originated "wholly with himself, and was not solicited by me." Why then should I be responsible, for a change in his mind, respecting a spontaneous proposal, and voluntary transaction? It is above all strange to ask back what was his, without offering to give me back also what was mine. Give me back my house, says Mr. Haldane. Am not I well entitled to reply, Give me back my situation when I accepted the possession of it?

Mr. Haldane says, page 13, "it may occur to me, that I "left my situation in the Established Church, expressly with "the view of obtaining this possession." I have produced evidence, in an early part of this detail*, that I was in the way of leaving the Established Church, when this possession was first offered me, and that the very reason of the offer was the known state and tendency of my sentiments. I was as open in avowing, and as bold in following them, as far as they had carried me, before I accepted the offer, as I was after it. This may be seen by my printed sermons, and my earliest writings in the Missionary Magazine. When I say, Give me back the situation, which I had, when I accepted the possession of

* See page 9.

the Glasgow Tabernacle, I do not mean, Get me re-admitted into the Established Church; but Restore me to the same liberty and advantage which I then had, of choosing my connections in the event of leaving it. I agreed to leave Edinburgh, to come to Glasgow, and to occupy the Tabernacle here, on the terms which Mr. Haldane proposed, with the view of co-operating in the scheme which he held out, of opening large places of worship, in the principal towns of Scotland; but it was by no means with the view of obtaining the possession of the house at Glasgow, that I left the Established Church. It is not for me to say what would have happened had I never left Edinburgh; neither do I repent having come to Glasgow; but I can say that this step was perfectly distinct from my leaving the Established Church, and was regretted by some, who left the Establishment along with me, as well as by others, whom I left in it.—If Mr. Haldane say, he cannot give me back what I demand; I answer, let him cease then to clamour for restitution, when he knows that the balance of the accompt is against him.

He proceeds to insinuate, that my "obtaining the Taber-"nacle might be, in some respect, *the reason* of my quitting "the Established Church." I agree with him, that IF this had been the case, the offer and the acceptance were both much to be regretted, and it would now be full time to renounce what I had received on so corrupt a principle. But I have already replied to this insinuation, and produced, as I conceive, sufficient evidence to banish it from every ingenuous mind. When I consider, that in this, as in every other scheme in which we embarked, Mr. Haldane sought to me, and not I to him; that, all things taken together, the Tabernacle in Glasgow has never been more comfortable, in a temporal view, than my former situation; that, although I have experienced the utmost kindness from the church, and from other quarters, my comforts have been repeatedly mingled by Mr. Haldane, with gall and wormwood; I confess I pity the man, who, after giving the most solemn assurances in word and writing of confidence in my integrity and disinterestedness, and that for many years, can now come forward with so vile an insinuation. I trust he is the only man, so long acquainted with me, who could suffer it to escape from his pen. It was unwise, as well as dishonourable, in Mr. Haldane, to make this insinuation; for, if I could regard it at all, I should feel it as the greatest possible obstacle to my compliance with his wishes. Whatever I might choose

to do, on other grounds; certainly if my giving up the Tabernacle were to be understood as a confession on my part, that I was conscious of having acted from a corrupt motive in receiving it, that consideration alone would compel me to retain it, till I should draw my last breath.

After having expressly insinuated that I *might have been* moved by a corrupt principle in accepting the Tabernacle, he takes credit to himself for by no means insinuating "that this *was* the case." Whether he avoided the direct charge for my sake, or for his own, let the reader judge. He adds, "No doubt, "the arrangements we then made, were an accommodation "to you, and must have operated to diminish any regret you "might have felt in quitting your former situation." The arrangements we then made, were *a sacrifice* on my part, and operated *to increase* the regret I felt in quitting my former situation. At Edinburgh were almost all my relatives, and almost all my Christian friends. At Glasgow I at that time knew not six individuals, from whom I could promise myself a hearty welcome. My sacrifice, in accepting the Tabernacle at Glasgow, was unspeakably greater than Mr. Haldane's, in giving it. No part of our arrangements was an accommodation to me, more than to him. The principal person, to whom my acceptance of the Glasgow Tabernacle could have been called an accommodation, was Mr. James Haldane, for whom my leaving Edinburgh, left the field more open; and this also was an accommodation to Mr. Robert Haldane, who, in his account of the scheme of the Tabernacles, already quoted, [see page 8,] acknowledges it to have been his object, that his brother should supply the Circus as the stated Minister. But Mr. Haldane should blush to speak of any of our arrangements, under the notion of personal accommodation. He knows, that if he had not held a different language, when they were made, none of his associates would have had any thing to do with either him or them. At that time, they were all an accommodation to our common pursuit of the object, which, in common, we professed to have in view, namely, a more enlarged propagation of the gospel at home. The principle on which any of his first coadjutors co-operated with Mr. Haldane, was, that of meeting on perfectly equal terms, to contribute our respective talents towards a purpose, which we all approved, without any idea that the contribution of property gave a preference to him, who had that talent, above those who had other talents.

But Mr. Haldane pleads, that "the unreserved and un-

" qualified manner in which he put the Tabernacle into my " hands, was evidently unlawful on Christian principles;"— " that it is clear that every man is responsible for the talents " committed to him,"—and " that it must therefore be con- " trary to duty, to transfer them to another individual, leaving " to him, during his life, their sole and uncontrolled direc- " tion *." What Mr. Haldane now calls " evident and clear," he has, according to his own account, taken about ten years to perceive. Whether my perception may, at last, arrive at the same discovery, I cannot say; but, at present, his statement of Christian principles, on this point, appears to me to be unknown in Scripture, and, indeed, to involve an absurdity. It amounts to this, that because property is a talent committed to a man, for which he is of course responsible; therefore, an unconditional transfer of it, in other words, to give any thing freely away, is a sin. Who does not see, that without such transfers, we may be guilty of many a sin? I do not say, we should give, where, at the time, we have no ground of confidence (though even if we had done so, it would be no justification of an attempt, years after, to insist on restoration); but where we have confidence, at the time, not only may a free gift be lawful, but the withholding of it may be a sin of omission. Some talents cannot be used without giving away; while the retention and accumulation of them is an absolute perversion. At any

* Letters, pages 12, 13.

Mr. Haldane subjoins a note, at this place, in which he sets up a distinction, which appears to me, by no means to obviate the objection to his scheme. I do not understand the difference " between the giving of property," and " the transference of capital," unless it be that the gift is final, and the transference may be temporary; in which case, I should suppose, the principles he pleads for would lead him to prefer the latter. But he seems to think that there is a difference between giving " for immediate and definite purposes," and " a transference of capital, which, by the production of interest, " or in some such way, continues its operation under any alteration of cir- " cumstances." I conceive that the argument, founded on this difference, is more plausible than solid. Property given away may continue its operation, in some productive way, as well as capital transferred; just as the latter may become unproductive, as well as the former. Alteration of circumstances may take place in both cases, and, in both, the regret of the original proprietor, and of the subsequent possessor, may be equally unavailing. The proprietor's prudence may be questionable, if he either give or transfer, for purposes of distant accomplishment and doubtful nature, when no great object can be attained. But when a great object is in view, purposes, even distant and undefined, may be well worth, all that is either given, or transferred, in the hope of fulfilling them. I am here replying merely to the abstract argument, without stopping to inquire how far it applies, or whether it applies at all, to the present question.

rate, confidence may have been perfectly innocent, on both sides, and may have led to transactions, which cannot be justly disannulled afterwards, although the bitterest disappointment may be mutually experienced.

Again, were Mr. Haldane's statement ever so correct, it does not apply to the case in question. He has not given me the sole and uncontrolled direction of any of his talents. He gave me the use of a house on certain conditions. The laxity of these was by no means an oversight. The house was transferred for purposes as immediate and definite, as our avowed principles on both sides permitted. Mr. Haldane well knows, that what he now considers as unlawful in the transaction, is what he would have admitted then, and I hold still, to be the only thing essential to its justification. Every thing, which could be fixed consistently with what he professed, was fixed by Mr. Haldane with the utmost precaution. Nothing could have been added to the conditions, to give them greater precision, but the subscription of a particular confession of faith, which Mr. Haldane knows I would have rejected in a moment. To recommend a transaction, when proposed, and to condemn it afterwards, when there is a desire to get rid of it, on the very same ground; and that while confessions of faith (the ground in question) are professedly viewed in the same light as ever; appears to me, to be a circumstance extremely suspicious. If I had thought any of Mr. Haldane's conditions sinful, when proposed, I trust I should have been kept from agreeing to them. If I now thought them sinful, I trust I should willingly relinquish that which binds me to observe them. A sense of sin, as to any part of the transaction, ought to make me forfeit every right of my own in the case; and I might do so, without insisting on taking away the rights of my neighbour. But as none of these suppositions is the fact, as I am doing nothing in the house which Mr. Haldane gave me a right to occupy, which I should not be led, by my views of duty, to do in a house of my own; he cannot expect, that the consideration he urges, should have any weight with me.

Further, were I persuaded that Mr. Haldane's statement was correct, and that it did apply to the case in question, such a persuasion would effectually prevent me, from complying with his desire. Does he say, that *the property* of the Tabernacle was a talent committed to him, and that it was, therefore, unlawful to transfer it to another individual, leaving to him, during his life, the sole and uncontrolled direction

of it? On the same principle, am not I obliged to say in return, that *the right of occupying* the Tabernacle is a talent committed to me, and that it is therefore unlawful to transfer it to another individual (his being the proprietor can make no difference) leaving to him, during his life, the sole and uncontrolled direction of it? Mr. Haldane speaks of the past: I should learn, from his errors, greater carefulness, as to present duty. When he gave me the use of the Tabernacle, he made all the conditions which he then thought necessary, and could consistently require, to exonerate himself for that use of his talent. But if, on the principle he has stated, I should give him the use of the Tabernacle back again, not only should I have no power to make conditions, but I should be transferring MY TALENT, with a moral certainty, that it would be perverted, as I judge, from the right use.

Mr. Haldane objects, page 14, to the manner in which the house was vested in my hands, because, "*in a stamped bond, "and under a certain penalty, I oblige myself to preach the gospel, "and to dispense divine ordinances, and to levy and collect seat-"rents, and offerings at the door, as the tenure by which I hold "my right.*" I see no sin in coming under an obligation to preach the gospel, and to dispense divine ordinances; nor yet in engaging to levy and collect seat-rents, and offerings at the door, as the condition on which I hold a place of worship. The deed, however, does not bind me *to preach the gospel*, but to do so *in that house*. Neither does it bind us to co-operate in the education of preachers (page 6), but only to apply the surplus of money, when there is any, to that purpose.

As levying and collecting seat-rents, and offerings at the door, may be thought the most questionable part of these conditions, I observe, that they appear to me to be merely various ways of raising voluntary contribution. Now, raising voluntary contribution is a practice expressly recommended in Scripture. Paul did so, in several churches, and desired Titus to do so likewise, 2 Cor. viii. and ix. The only things necessary to justify this practice, are, a proper object; "a willing mind," on the part of the givers; and "the avoiding of blame," on the part of the receivers, "by providing for honest things, "not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of "men." In this case, the object is, the justifiable one surely of defraying necessary expences, with the laudable purpose of devoting every annual surplus to the training up and educating of young men, for the ministry of the gospel. The willingness of the givers is not violated by exhorting them,

or stirring them up to imitate the example of others, as sufficiently appears by the chapters above quoted. But even this is more than has ever been done in the Glasgow Tabernacle. The letting of the seats is merely intimated, and the object of the collections at the door, viz. the expences of the house and the education of young men for the ministry, is intimated at the same time. No one is ever required to take a seat, either for himself or family. A third part of the house cannot be let, and, therefore the whole church might have free seats if they chose; but no regulation requires a single seat to be taken, unless the people desire it. That a third part of the house is free, is intimated at the same time with the letting of the seats. In like manner, no exhortation has ever been given respecting the ordinary collections at the door. The object is merely published, and every one is left entirely to the freedom of his own will. Exhortations to liberality have been confined to extraordinary collections for particular objects, such as missions, or to particular demands for the supply of the poor at times of peculiar distress. There has, indeed, been very little need of exhortation on these subjects, as "the grace of God," bestowed on the people for these duties, has all along been very abundant. Mr. Haldane's laboured attempt, in his Address to the Church, to make it appear that the contributions of the congregation "are not voluntary but forced *," requires no answer from me, as it is notorious to all, who have ever attended the Tabernacle, that his description is merely the offspring of his own imagination.—On the other hand, the receivers of these contributions avoid all blame, by the regularity of their proceedings. Some of the deacons always assist the gentleman who acts for me, who is himself a deacon, and has been employed with the concurrence of Mr. Haldane, in letting the seats; and the money received is entered in a book, open to their inspection, from which the annual accompts are made out. The deacons also assist in making the collections at the door, and keep a book for marking down the sums received, with which the book of the gentleman who acts for me, is compared and checked, and the annual accompts are confirmed. All these things I state to the public, in consequence of the accusations brought against my friends and me by Mr. Haldane: to him, they were all perfectly known, when he brought his accusations.

* Letters, page 80.

I request that the manner, in which he speaks of these things now, may be compared with the manner in which, with his knowledge and consent, if not expressly under his direction, they are spoken of in the letter, inserted at page 60.

Suppose now, what I dare say often happens, that a rich brother should say to an Independent or a Baptist Church, I have a large empty house in your neighbourhood, which may both accommodate you and any strangers who may attend. If you choose, I shall fit it up for you, and make you very welcome to it, as long as you use it solely for a place of worship, and not only defray your internal expences in a peaceable and equitable manner, but exercise liberality towards other churches, in proportion as your own burden is diminished. Would the giver and the receivers have sinned in this case? Suppose, again, this brother should say, a proposal of this kind should be made, and agreed to, not in words merely, but in writing. Would the transaction become sinful, as soon as it was drawn out on paper? Make a further supposition: the rich brother adds, I believe you and I, brethren, would be perfectly satisfied with the exchange of missive letters on this business. But you should not accept of accommodation, to hold it at the mere will of any man. Besides, I may soon die, and no man can answer for his heirs. On these accounts, I shall give you a tack, or let us throw all the conditions about which we are agreed, into the form of a regular and legal contract. Would not all these things be perfectly fair, and reasonable? Would they not be equally so in the case of a rich brother, and an individual preacher of the gospel? When Paul "separated "the disciples at Corinth, disputing daily in the school of "one Tyrannus," Acts xix. 9.; I see nothing, in any part of Scripture, to prevent me from believing, that he would have accepted every one of the above mentioned offers, if they had been made to him, by the proprietor of the house. Jesus directed his disciples to accept of food and lodging, when received into a house, because "the labourer is "worthy of his hire." Can it be supposed that they would object to receiving accommodation for preaching the gospel?

But why did I oblige myself to preach and to dispense divine ordinances in the house, *in a stamped bond and under a certain penalty?* I ask another question. Why did the kinsman of Boaz, when he gratuitously resigned his right of redemption, "*draw off his shoe?*" Ruth iv. 8. Or why did

Jeremiah, when he bought the field of Hanameel, "*subscribe* "*the evidence, and seal it, and take witnesses, and weigh the* "*money in the balances, and take the evidence of the purchase, both* "*that which was sealed according to the law and custom, and that* "*which was open, and give the evidence of the purchase unto* "*Baruch, in the sight of Hanameel, and in the presence of the* "*witnesses that subscribed the book of the purchase, before all the* "*Jews that sat in the court of the prison?*" Jer. xxxii. 9—12. To all these questions the answer is one: To give the transactions validity, by a lawful and necessary observance of the laws and customs of the age and country in which they respectively took place. The stamped bond and the certain penalty, do nothing more than prevent my tenure of the Tabernacle from being nugatory and delusive. They give it a security, which, I am sorry to say, it could not have, from any verbal agreement, made by one of the parties, however sacred in a religious and moral point of view. Is this the reason why Mr. Haldane complains of these formalities as a grievance? I am well entitled to ask the question; for the stamped bond, in defiance of which he now asks back the Tabernacle, is merely a transcript of his own proposal, his word, and promise.

But does not this bond "savour strongly of that worldly "system, which I had renounced?" And why should it not? Is not a house a worldly thing? Ought not an agreement about the destination of this worldly thing to be made in such a way, that it shall hold valid in the world? I never renounced a lawful worldly system as to worldly things. In the beginning of his pamphlet, Mr. Haldane sets out with an assertion, which I can by no means admit. He says that "the obligation referred to in his Letters, was a transaction "between us, solely of a religious nature; it had no connec- "tion whatever with temporal concerns *." The reverse of this is precisely the fact. The obligation referred to in his Letters, was a transaction between us of a mixed nature. It originated from a connection in religious, and extended to a connection in temporal, concerns. This mixed nature of the transaction was perfectly understood and distinctly recognised by us. When we discussed the religious concerns, from a connection with which it originated, we went for a settlement, to our bibles and to our knees: when we discussed the temporal concerns, to a connection with which it ex-

* Page 5.

tended, we went for a settlement, to Mr. Haldane's man of business, Mr. Alexander Duncan, writer to the signet. Mr. Haldane never professed to view the transaction as solely of a religious nature, till he wanted an argument for setting it aside. To make settlements, involving things of a worldly nature, in a manner which shall have no connection whatever with any temporal concerns, appears to me to be an impossibility. Unless the man, who should propose such an attempt, were very simple, and completely ignorant of human affairs, I should consider his motives as liable to suspicion. If Mr. Haldane, or any one else, has induced a preacher, or a church of any denomination, to occupy a house, in virtue of a transaction solely of a religious nature, let them look to themselves; they are entirely at the proprietor's mercy, however much they may have been led to dream of safety, and however liberal they may have been to others, on his recommendation, from their confidence in his fidelity.

These remarks, it may be thought, apply only to a sale. I conceive that they apply to any mutual transaction whatever. In the beginning of his pamphlet, Mr. Haldane also says of our mutual transaction, that "it was entirely gratuitous, as he was under no previous obligation to me." Certainly he was under no previous obligation to me; and I plead this fact, as presumptive evidence, that I accepted of nothing gratuitous from him. I was not much in the habit of accepting gratuities from gentlemen. How can the grant of the Tabernacle be called gratuitous? Is not an engagement to devote time and talents for the promotion of an object which Mr. Haldane had in view, in every proper sense of the word, *value* given? The case, when truly stated, stands thus: Mr. Haldane proposed a common object for our co-operation, namely, a more extensive propagation of the gospel at home. Towards that object we agreed to devote our respective contributions. The contribution, on his part, including all the Tabernacles, if estimated in proportion to our fortunes, may be called equal to a loan from me of twenty pounds. The contribution, on my part, was my stated and personal labours, when health should enable me, in preaching the gospel, and dispensing divine ordinances. To these stated and personal labours, in a very large house, I have applied my health and strength accordingly, for about ten years, in the course of which, besides many liberal collections for purposes, which Mr. Haldane professes

to have greatly at heart, and many others, which indirectly at least tend to his advantage, because they have diminished the debt of many places of worship, on which he holds securities for money advanced; it will appear from the accompts, that he has received of direct surplus, about three hundred and eighty pounds. After all this I am coolly told, that the transaction between us was entirely gratuitous *. The reader may make his own remarks:—I say nothing.

Mr. Haldane surely does not mean to argue, that because the transaction provided for using the house as a place of worship; therefore, it should not have been so confirmed as to be valid. If it be wrong to *occupy* a place of worship, in virtue of a stamped bond, and under a certain penalty, it must be equally wrong to *possess* a place of worship, in virtue of a stamped bond, and under a certain penalty, or to *hold securities for money advanced* on a place of worship, in virtue of stamped bonds, and under certain penalties. What then will become of several portions of Mr. Haldane's property? He calls on me to give up my stamped bond. Has he given up any of his own? Does he intend to do it? Will he do it if required; or if I set him the example?

He exclaims, "how totally dissimilar is it to any thing "we meet with in the apostolic writings." Really I cannot see in what respects it is dissimilar. I own, indeed, that I have never yet met with any thing in the apostolic writings, which bore particularly on the subject. If Mr. Haldane will direct me to the place, where the apostles inform us, in what manner a right to occupy a house as a place of worship ought to be made out; I shall read it with attention, and be happy that the church I belong to, should obtain a similar right, for I have no doubt it will be a valid one. The fact that no directions are given in the New Testament for building, or for giving, and receiving the use of places of worship, is an additional proof, were any wanting, that all such transactions are of a worldly nature. Yet surely it will not be said, that because it is a worldly transaction, a church of Christ cannot be sheltered from the weather, by a valid contract, without a violation of the apostolic writings. It seems curious that Mr. Haldane should perceive so much of "the worldly savour" in his contract, and none of it at all in

* In the very same page too he confesses, that my giving up the Tabernacle will be no pecuniary advantage to him, *but the reverse.* How do these things hang together?

the proposal of a sale.—I find the apostles, (Phil. iv. 8.) recommending to our consideration "whatsoever things are just." As they judged, that "it was not reason that they should "leave the word of God and serve tables;" so, I conceive, they left the rules for the transfer and destination of worldly things, to be settled by "the higher powers" in every age and country of the world; satisfied with enforcing on the disciples that golden rule of our Saviour, "Whatsoever things "ye would that men should do unto you; do ye also the same "unto them." With this rule, I think, our mutual transaction entirely accords; for had I been in Mr. Haldane's place, and he in mine, I know not the article in which I should have wished an alteration.

In the introduction, (p. 5,) he says, "the propriety and "legality of the whole, must THEREFORE be judged of "according to the nature and laws of that kingdom, which "is not of this world." Is it, then, on account of the supposed peculiarities only of this case, that the propriety and legality of it must be thus judged? I should have thought that Mr. Haldane would have admitted of a much more extensive application of the laws of that kingdom. If he engage in any transaction whatever, the propriety and legality of which will not bear to be judged of according to the nature and laws of that kingdom which is not of this world; in that transaction he is not acting like a subject of the kingdom of heaven. The distinction, which he wishes to establish, appears to me to be equally unfounded and dangerous. It is precisely that of the man, who is reported to have said, that he prayed as a bishop, and swore as the colonel of a regiment of dragoons.

But if the stamped bond be so bad a thing, let us suppose it were burnt. Would Mr. Haldane be then entitled to plead, that nothing existed between us, which could infer obligation on either side? What could he say to his letter of March 20th, 1800, in which there is no stamp? In that letter he has said, page 36. "As you must know, that I never intended "to hint, in the most distant manner, that it would be "proper under any new arrangement, that the fundamental "article of our agreement, I mean your possessing the house "for life, or while you officiated in it, if you chose, should "in the least be infringed, so while you continue, *you are* "*perfectly secured at all events*." If Mr. Haldane will abide by these words, I shall have no occasion for the stamped bond: If he will not, especially if he alleges the apostolic

writings as his apology, I really do not see how he can vindicate himself, from the charge of the most jesuitical immorality.

Mr. Haldane's next objection, page 14, is, that "the way "in which my salary is levied is by no means regulated by "the Christian law. Instead of its being given to me by the "Church over which I preside, in obedience to the authority "of Jesus Christ, and in token of their regard and affection "to me, *it is raised by the whole promiscuous multitude which "attends the place of worship, to many of whom the destination of "what they contribute is unknown.*" This arrangement, so far as it is fairly stated, appears to me, to be exactly as such a thing ought to be. I am happy in an opportunity of testifying against an error, which is at present very zealously taught, respecting "the Christian law" on this subject, and which tends to cut off resources for the support of the gospel, which God hath expressly directed his people to employ. The law in question is by no means confined to the relation between pastors and churches, but, in the most comprehensive manner, saith, "Do ye not know, that they which "minister about holy things, live of the temple? and they which "wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar? Even so hath "the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel, should "live of the gospel," 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14. As the Levites and priests were to be wholly supported, according to the Mosaic law; so they who preach the gospel are to be wholly supported, according to the Christian law. This ordinance of the Lord applied equally to the apostles, to the seventy disciples, and to stated pastors. See Luke ix. 4, 5. and x. 5—12. 1 Cor. ix. 7. Gal. vi. 6—10. It is a great mistake, to say, that a preacher of the gospel should take no support from the promiscuous multitude that attends his preaching. Christ directed the seventy disciples to take support, not only from a house, but from a city, Luke x. 8. which should receive them. This "receiving" can signify nothing more than willingness to attend their preaching, and to support them while engaged in it; for conversion did not advance by the mass of a city at a time. Wherever, then, there was a willingness to hear, the labourer might take what was given: wherever there was not, he was to refuse to carry away so much as the dust of the streets. In like manner in churches, when all was love and peace, as at Philippi, the labourer might receive support, not only while with them, but even when at a distance; but when there was a faction, as at

Corinth, or perverse disputings of ungodly men, and poverty among the approved, as at Ephesus, his own hands were to minister to his necessities, and to them that were with him, and he was to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, " it is more blessed to give than to receive." On these principles, I trust, I shall ever be ready to preach the gospel, whether I be supported in doing so or not; and while this conduct will be a testimony for me, the loss, I may sustain, will be a testimony against them, who shall bring it upon me.

Against taking support from those who are not acknowledged as fellow Christians, an argument is sometimes drawn from 3 John 7. " for his name's sake they went forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles." I cannot think that John is here speaking of any uniform practice of the apostles, or referring to any command of Christ about taking, or refusing, support from those to whom the gospel is preached. He tells Gaius, verse 6, what he expects from him towards those, who desired to make the gospel without charge to the Gentiles, as they had formerly been enabled to do, through his bounty, and that of other Christians; but the language by no means implies, that it would have been unlawful to accept of what the Gentiles might freely offer, especially where there might be no church at hand, or no church, nor individual like Gaius, capable of assisting them. In that case, unless the brethren had been themselves rich men, they must either not have gone to the Gentiles at all, or have been content to receive their support from them.—Notwithstanding, however, the general warrant given by our Saviour, and the general propriety of acting on it where men are fixed and known, it may be freely acknowledged, that there is a peculiar delicacy in the case of " brethren who are strangers." As Paul thought it would have been " abusing his power in the gospel," 1 Cor. ix. 18. to have accepted support from a church agitated by faction; so itinerants might expose themselves to much jealousy and reproach, were they to accept support wherever they go. It was, therefore, a praise-worthy token of disinterested piety, and formed a peculiar claim on Christians who were able to entertain or support them, when " brethren and " strangers for Christ's name's sake went forth, taking " nothing of the Gentiles." These principles were, at one period, professed by the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home, with an allusion to this very passage of Scripture; and hence, the general belief that they gave their preachers sufficient support.

If preachers of the gospel must, in no case, receive any thing except from members of a church, why did Paul, and some brethren who accompanied him, accept the hospitality, and bounty of so many at Melita, Acts xxviii. 7—10? In the first instance, indeed, the barbarous people showed them kindness not as preachers of the gospel, but as men who had suffered shipwreck. But Paul exhibited a miracle, which excited admiration. He exercised his gift of healing, and we may be sure, he would not forbear to preach the gospel. Had any believed, much more had a church been collected in consequence, we can hardly doubt that the historian, who had mentioned their ignorant saying of Paul, " that he was a " god," would have mentioned the subsequent profession of their faith. Without any hint of this kind, however, we find Paul and his companions accepting of three days hospitality from one; of many honours from others during three months that he staid on the island; and of a stock of things necessary when he departed. If it be said that Paul was then under the necessity of taking such things as the Gentiles offered, it is evidently a mistake. A Roman sent as a prisoner to Rome, in consequence of an appeal to Cæsar, could never have been denied such an allowance, as was necessary for his support, in any part of the Roman empire. It has never been doubted that this island, whether in the Mediterranean Sea or Adriatic Gulf, belonged to that empire; and the chief man of the island, whose name was Publius, was probably the Roman governor, subject, however, (if it was the island of Malta) to the Prætor of Sicily *. Had it been unlawful to take any thing from the Gentiles, after his character was known as a servant of God, and a preacher of the gospel, Paul would either have wrought, if necessary, a miracle for his support, or have laboured working with his hands, as he had done elsewhere, at an occupation in which he might have found employment in any country in the world. But if any necessity were admitted in this case, to what would it amount? It would be just such a necessity, as must often exist, when men, not of independent fortune, devote themselves to the preaching of the gospel, even in countries which are called Christian. The churches in Asia or Greece could not assist Paul in Melita; and if the churches in any place cannot support all who go forth preaching the gospel, it matters not, whether their inability arise from distance of situation, or poverty of circumstances.

* See Grotius and Bishop Pearce on the place.

When the preceding remarks are duly considered, it will appear, that there is no Scriptural distinction between a church, and the congregation at large, as to the support which ought to be given to those who preach the gospel. When the Lord inclines any, to whom the preacher ministers, to contribute towards his support, he teaches the preacher to receive it, as matter of right, knowing that "the labourer is "worthy of his hire." Accordingly, I received a salary before the church in the Tabernacle existed, because I was then preaching the gospel, and entitled to live by it: and I might receive a salary, even if that church were dissolved, for if I should then be preaching the gospel, I should still be entitled to live by it.—But our arrangement is far from being fairly stated by Mr. Haldane. It is not true, that my salary "is "raised by the whole promiscuous multitude which attends "the place of worship." None of them give money either at the door, or for seats, unless they are so inclined; many of them give nothing, and yet their attendance is beheld with joy. Under no arrangement can it be more truly said, "To the poor the gospel is preached." The very contributions which are made, instead of preventing, are conducive to, this effect; for they support an institution which is peculiarly adapted to the accommodation of the poor *, and to the sending forth of preachers of the gospel.—Neither is it true, that "many know not the destination of "what they contribute." It has been so regularly announced from the pulpit, and otherwise published, that it has all along been a matter of public notoriety, especially among those who attend at the Tabernacle †.

The principles, which I have been stating, were once the principles of Mr. Haldane; and they entered essentially into all our original schemes. They held a distinguished place in the institution of the Tabernacles, in the education of the first classes, in the constitution of the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home, in the building of places of worship throughout the country, and in the support of itinerants, and stated ministers. Collections, having "more immediately in "view, the relief of the soul," were, as is justly said in the letter, inserted page 60, what Mr. Haldane proposed. They

* See Mr. Haldane's Address to the Public, pages 75—81. of the first edition.

† Compare this objection of Mr. Haldane's with what he authorised in the letter, which is inserted at page 60.

were, indeed, his favourite scheme. So much was this the case, that he often grieved his friends, by refusing the use of the Tabernacle in Edinburgh, when extraordinary collections were proposed, which had more immediately in view the relief of the body. After thus carrying his love of collections for the relief of the soul even to excess, Mr. Haldane has, at length, receded. To give him back his own language, in a much juster application, than that in which he has employed it, "He turns his back, he refuses the practice, and abandons the "principles." By suddenly withdrawing support from preachers, and poor churches, and, at the same time, endeavouring to argue them out of the lawfulness of the principal resource which they still enjoy; he has brought a greater portion of distress upon a whole denomination of Christians, than has been known in this country, since the times of open persecution.—He complains of my ridicule in my late publication on church government. But did ever ridicule run so completely mad, as in the description of the mode of making collections, which he gives, in his Address to the Church at Glasgow, pages 78—81? When he speaks of "deacons observing what "each one gives as he passes," he must surely refer, not so much to what is done at Glasgow, as to what he himself insisted on being done at Edinburgh. He cannot have forgotten the conspicuous situation which he chose for the deacon's box at the door of the Tabernacle in Edinburgh; nor be ignorant, that the deacons were so much hurt at it, that some of them, at least, never entered that box, while attending the collections. Mr. Haldane thinks, that for all these practices, he may get off with this verbal confession, "I take much shame to myself." What! must I make restitution to him, and is he under no obligation to make restitution to the public? Though the money may be all spent, yet, by his own acknowledgement, he had no right to raise it, and, of course, no right to direct its application. No man is better able to refund than he, and it will be easy to devote what is recovered to a purpose with which the public will be perfectly satisfied. Let him then apply his italics to himself *. *He is bound on the principles of common honesty to restore that money.*

On this subject, Mr. Haldane adds †, "From these con- "siderations, I could not, as you wished, animadvert on the "observations made upon you, two years ago, in the Liver- "pool Magazine." What I wished Mr. Haldane to do,

* Letters, page 62. † Page 14.

respecting those observations in the Liverpool Magazine, was nothing more than what every honest man will feel himself bound to do, whenever he is called upon, viz. to bear witness to that which he knows to be truth. A writer in that Magazine had asserted, that I had legal security for a stipend. This is false, and Mr. Haldane knew it to be false. He knew the fact to be (as the public also know now, since the tack has been printed) that I have not legal security for a single farthing, unless the house produce it, and that what I said, in my Exposure of Mr. Brown, is strictly true; viz. "that for "the amount, the payment, and the permanence of their "stipends, they (the Ministers of the Tabernacles in Scot-"land) have no security whatever, but what rests on the "love of the people to whom they minister." I did not wish for *animadversions* from Mr. Haldane, on the observations in the Liverpool Magazine. I wished for his *testimony* as a witness, in support of a fact. No pretext of difference of opinion, about collections and seat-rents, could justify him in withholding his testimony. I was entitled to have called for it from any man whatever, to whom the fact had been known; and when I saw Mr. Haldane decline to do me the common justice, which a mere stranger would have done, in such a case; I certainly did think, that I had an opponent nearer home, than the writer in the Liverpool Magazine. This sentence, in Mr. Haldane's letter, establishes an important fact. It is but lately that he has demanded the Tabernacle, and he urges as a reason for the demand, my late publication; but it escapes him now, that, for two years before July 29th, 1808, the date of his letter, he has had a secret grudge at my situation; and that to such a degree, as to leave me willingly a prey to any anonymous adversary, and even to withhold evidence as to matter of fact. In referring to this subject, therefore, he has only made a new display of injuries, which I have received from him.

"The choice too," says Mr. Haldane, "and appointment "of an *assistant minister*, are secured exclusively to yourself. "Does not this *amount to patronage?*"—I have already given a full account (pages 65—68) of every thing relating to the "choice and appointment of an assistant minister." I have now to observe, that this is the first time Mr. Haldane has ever objected, so far as I know, to the exercise of patronage. The reader has already seen how strenuously I have opposed, and he has defended it, [see pages 34, 41, 47, 48, 53, 54.] The evil, which he now sees in it, seems to consist in this, that

it should be vested in any body but himself. His own share in the appointment of my assistant has also been already noticed [see page 67]; and, if I may judge from his conduct hitherto in the choice and appointment of scores of preachers, I must believe that, if he had it, he would exercise the patronage, in this case, with the most perfect satisfaction. "When you oppose a plurality of elders," says Mr. Haldane, "as '*unscriptural*,' where do you find your warrant for the "assistant minister, not only chosen by yourself, but entirely "dependent on you for his continuance in the office?" My opposition to a plurality of elders, like many other things in my late Statement, is here misrepresented. I have said, that "no part of the word of God shows it to be necessary;" and that an increase of the number, till we get "a church of "bishops within the church, is unscriptural," (page 118). But I have never opposed the existence of the thing itself as unscriptural; although, I confess, that to affect to understand me in this way, makes it an easier task to reply to my reasoning. My sentiments, as I have stated them myself, are not, in the smallest degree, inconsistent, either with an assistant or a colleague, when circumstances render it desirable to have one. There was a time, when Mr. Haldane confessed an assistant, in my situation, to be necessary. [See his Letter of March 4th, 1800, inserted above, page 35]. He then professed to be willing to help, rather than to oppress me. But, perhaps, it was an instance of his counteracting the design, as he says, of that plan of reformation, on which he has invariably proceeded to this hour, although, at first, he was far from fully comprehending it.

Through two long paragraphs (pages 81—83), Mr. Haldane labours to prove, that the bond has introduced a most enormous evil, respecting my assistants. As to this alleged evil, I wonder how it has been introduced by the bond. If it had all other faults, it certainly is not guilty of providing me with any assistant. When I "stand in "need of assistance on the Lord's day, the bond has in-"troduced an evil, because young men are employed,"—or, as the writer of the first edition of this story, more pleasantly, though less truly, expresses it, "men or boys" are "employed to supply my place."—This evil has been of long standing, for Timothy was employed to assist Paul. Perhaps, however, I should remain destitute of assistance, because I am not an apostle; although my lungs are not one whit the stronger on that account. But these young men are "from

" a distance." So were many of the converts on the day of Pentecost, some of whom made very good assistants. I thought that, in a church of Christ, there had been no distinctions of far and near, of place and nation. Jealousy of foreigners seems to me, to be a principle rather of a worldly nature. If, however, their being " from a distance," be an evil, I answer, Not Guilty. I did not bring them from a distance, and, when other circumstances suit, I never refuse assistance from natives of Glasgow. Those assistants, who are from a distance, came of their own accord, for the sake of " attending the College;" and, though engaged still in the prosecution of their studies, they are not " novices," but have, for several years, been in christian fellowship, and were all approved preachers of the gospel in the churches from which they came.—But these young men are employed " at the rate of a guinea, or half a guinea." Aye! this is the evil. " Here is a practice sufficient to corrupt all the churches, " most unscriptural and unseemly in itself, and dangerous in " its tendency." I confess, that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump; and if this practice be sufficient to corrupt ALL the churches, they will be leavened with a *little* leaven indeed. It is, it seems, " most unscriptural." Does he mean, that the fact of paying any thing, or that the amount of the payments, is unscriptural? In either case, his assertion appears to me, to be refuted by that most scriptural maxim; " the " labourer is worthy of his hire." I really never heard a sermon from any, who have favoured me with their assistance, which I did not think more of, than I do either of half a guinea, or a guinea.—The practice is also " unseemly." I suppose Mr. Haldane will admit, that, if I have shown it to be scriptural, I have shown that it cannot be unseemly. But, perhaps, he judges of seemliness by comparison. Let our readers, then, make a comparison. I employ preachers, at the rate of a guinea, or half a guinea a sermon; and he—I beg pardon—the Society for propagating the Gospel at Home, employs them at the rate of 20*l.* or 12*l.* in the eleven months [see above, p. 110—112]. Which of these practices is the most unseemly?—It is " dangerous in its tendency." If so, then the ordinance of the Lord, " that they who preach the gospel " should live of the gospel," is dangerous in its tendency. It is not thus, that Mr. Haldane generally speaks of divine ordinances.—He adds, " such a one, I believe, has never " been admitted, in any shape, into some of the most " worldly religious systems in Scotland." Here, he is per-

fectly correct. It is one of the faults of the Church of Scotland, that she does not make proper provision for her probationers. When Mr. Haldane recommends to our imitation so bad an example, is he not "sensible that he is counteracting the design of that plan of reformation, on which, "though far from comprehending it, he is invariably proceeding?"—He blames me for not considering "its baneful "effects elsewhere." I wish he had been explicit, and told me, where this "elsewhere" lies. I have seen "baneful "effects," indeed, from the neglect of this practice, but none from the observance of it; and, I trust, I shall be excused for not considering what I have not seen.

When Mr. Haldane says, "these young men are sometimes little known to the church," he states what is contrary to fact. They have all been received into the fellowship of the church, in the usual way, in consequence of personal conversation, and satisfactory recommendation, and their principles and character have been certified to the church, on the testimony of two or three witnesses. This being the case, I conceive it to be quite unwarrantable in any man to pretend that they are little known to the church. They are known to it as all the other members are known to it; and few of the rest can be better known than they are. I do not deny that, when they first arrived, and were recommended to me, as preachers of the gospel, by Christian friends in whom I confided, I asked some of them to preach forthwith; and this, I suppose, is a practice, which has been common among all Christians, in such a case, from the days of the Apostles. But Mr. Haldane, and his present associates, are desirous of exciting jealousy against men, who do not embrace the Glassite scheme of church government, and can ably oppose it; and, with a humbling degree of indifference as to the means they employ, they speak of them as mere strangers, as men of suspicious principles, and inferior qualifications. Thus, the original writer on this subject, says, they "are much more unfit to teach the church than "many of the members are;" evidently insinuating that they are not members, which, if he had been desirous of accuracy in so important a statement, he could easily have discovered to be false. In the same spirit, Mr. Haldane asserts, that they are in general very ill qualified, "to teach a Christian church." I have no doubt, he is ready to make the same assertion now with regard to myself, and therefore my opinion of my assistants will have little weight with him. I may say,

however, to the public, that I think my assistants from a distance, have, generally, given as much satisfaction to the church at large, as my former assistants generally did, and are at least equally qualified to teach it. At the same time, while I have the most unfeigned respect for every one of them, I by no means pretend that they possess infallibility; nor do I deny, that there may be members of the church equally qualified, occasionally, to edify. But the young men are preferred to them as assistants in preaching, because I conceive it to be duty to call, in preference, upon those, who are more immediately and completely devoted to the work. I conceive also, that students for the ministry, are a peculiarly important object of the pastoral care; and, although the young men in question have come from a distance, and may probably go to a distance again; although they may not have attained the highest maturity of knowledge and experience; although their views of truth, like all our views of it, may admit of additional clearness and enlargement; I should feel myself culpably indifferent to their present improvement, and their future usefulness, if I did not invite them, occasionally, to exercise themselves among us, in the preaching of the gospel. I am happy to know, that the Lord has blessed such exercises both to them, and to some of their hearers; and who can tell, how many seals of their ministry the Lord may yet show, that he has given them in this place?

When I said, that "I was not ashamed to confess, that I "had often been much more edified by the remarks of a "plain man, who had seriously perused his English Bible, "than by the lecture of a clergyman who had collected for "retail from a mass of commentators," I expressed no sentiments to which I have now to "recur," for I have never departed from them in the smallest degree. But the question, here, does not lie between plain serious men, and clergymen who lecture or preach merely from commentators. It lies between men, equally recognised by the church as disciples of Christ; between men, some of whom are necessarily engaged in worldly business, while others are wholly given to study; some of whom preach, indeed, occasionally in more private situations, and, so far as I know, have no desire to be brought more publicly forward; while others have the desire, and the prospect, if the Lord will, of becoming stated labourers for life in the vineyard of the Lord.—When Mr. Haldane questions me about "the severe

" though ludicrous terms in which, in my writings, I have " reprehended the clergy of the Church of Scotland, for " setting up young men to teach in their place," I wish he had referred to the passages, in which such reprehensions occur. Surely they are not in those Animadversions, which the reader has seen him, calling not only " excellent," but written " in a proper spirit," (see above, page 37). I may have thought the clergy did not always employ the most proper young men, but if I have reprehended them for the simple fact of employing young men, I must have condemned both Mr. Haldane and myself at the same time.— It is very improper in Mr. Haldane, thus, to attack me, about my assistants, when he is conscious, that it is his own clandestine measures for corrupting the principles of the late classes at Edinburgh, which have deprived me of all hope of assistance from the usual quarter. Had I taken " men or " boys" of his training, all would have been well. But because I cannot, in conscience, do this, and because a gracious Providence has not left me to struggle alone amidst labours, universally allowed to be too heavy for human nature, but has provided me, through an unexpected channel, with such as cordially assist, and do not undermine me; therefore misrepresentation and sophistry are eagerly combined, if possible, to bring an odium on us all.

Mr. Haldane objects, (page 15,) that " the church occupy " the house wholly at my pleasure, and that this is a strong " temptation implicitly to submit to me." The reader has already had evidence laid before him from Mr. Haldane's own letters, that if there be any thing in our contract unsuitable to the connection of a pastor and a church, it was not with my will, that it was permitted to continue *. Has he admitted the force of his present objection in the case of the churches in Leith Walk, and in various other parts of the kingdom, to which it applies with at least equal force? Let him remove this " strong temptation" from the many churches, which occupy houses wholly at his pleasure, and I shall most cheerfully follow his example as to the Tabernacle in Glasgow. Whatever dependence the church may have on me for present accommodation, I have never availed myself of that dependence; far less have I ever turned a church out of doors, because they would not follow me in every new proposal, as Mr. Haldane has done in more instances than one;

* See above, page 58, 59.

and that " without sending messengers to the spot, calmly " to investigate the matter, and affectionately to remonstrate " if error was discovered, giving their best advice, joined " with their fervent prayers, and waiting for a season to " observe the effect." (See his Letters, page 39.)—He objects to me also, that " Last year I informed him of my " determination to allow no discussion in the church on the " subjects lately agitated." He might have done me the justice to have added my authority for this determination, namely, 2 Tim. ii. 23. " But foolish and untaught questions " avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes." It must be obvious to all, that it can never be the duty of a pastor to allow discussions in the church on all subjects, which, in some other churches, may have been lately agitated.

In page 15, Mr. Haldane says, " I would also remark on " the assistance you give to build other places of worship, " ought not the church to be taught first to *provide for itself?*" Was this the language of Mr. Haldane, when he used to send preacher after preacher among us, to solicit donations, subscriptions, and collections, for building places of worship, certifying, at the same time, that the rights of the houses had been legally made out by a man of business? His language, then, was, " unless you voluntarily choose to give " something towards defraying the expence of the house, " you may sit with as little cost as if still in a parish church," [see above, page 61.] We did not suspect, that he would first renounce a claim, in consideration of which, he was sure he could draw, for a time, with peculiar advantage, on our liberality, and then revive it as boldly as if we had never heard of that renunciation.

After urging that the church should be taught to provide for itself, Mr. Haldane proceeds, " Instead of this, if any " thing is wanted to be done in the house in which they " assemble, I am applied to, and asked to allow it from the " surplus of income, which, by the stipulation in the bond, " belongs to me; and not only so, but also to make up the " shortcoming of the Assistant's salary." When a man is obliged to reply to a statement which is diametrically opposite to fact, he is placed in a most unpleasant situation. Unhappily I am, at present, speaking from experience. Mr. Haldane appeals to the bond, to prove that what is wanted to be done in the house, he is asked to allow out of a surplus which belongs to him. But does not the bond expressly say, that before any surplus be accounted for, and

paid over, I shall retain—" Fourthly, the necessary repairs " of the said house?" Nay, if the funds of the house should fail to answer these purposes, " then the said Robert Hal- " dane and his aforesaid, shall be holden and obliged to " satisfy and pay the said feu-duties or ground-rents and " REPAIRS of the building." The truth is, that, by the bond, not a single farthing of the surplus belongs to Mr. Robert Haldane. It belongs " to the said Robert Hal- " dane, Esquire, Mr. James Haldane, his brother, Mr. Wil- " liam Innes—and the said Greville Ewing himself, and the " survivors or survivor of them, to be by them or him applied " for training up and educating young men to the ministry " of the gospel in Scotland." Again, Mr. Haldane asserts that he is asked to make up the shortcoming of the Assist- ant's salary. Alas, alas! how was the shortcoming of the Assistant's salary *made up?* It was made up, by *cutting his salary down.* I have already produced Mr. Haldane's postscript, dated October 18th, 1804, (see above, page 67,) in which he says, " there will surely be no need to give more to the " Assistant going to you than what the house affords, after " paying last year's arrear. You know he will have much " more than any of his companions."

Mr. Haldane says, in the same page, he is " convinced " of the unlawfulness of the whole transaction, both on my " side, and on his own." He ought, then, to act agreeably to his conviction, and refuse to have any thing more to do with that which he thinks unlawful. On the other hand, as I am perfectly satisfied of its equity, I ought to be permitted to abide by it, without molestation.—It would appear, how- ever, from what he says, soon after, (page 16,) that he thinks he can make my situation sufficiently embarrassing, and indeed altogether untenable, whenever he pleases. " You " have consulted law on this business, but if I should enforce " what the bond authorises me at any time to do, it might " occasion to you some trouble. The monthly collections " not accounted for to me, are contrary to it. An Assistant " minister, as the agreement provides, would not suit your " ideas, and you would find yourself bound in the most " express manner, to account for all the different collections, " with the exception of occasional ones, made ' in the house, " ' or at the doors' of the Tabernacle."

These are the words of a gentleman, who blames me for having consulted law in this business. Does he not now very plainly show me, that my only error lies, in not having

consulted it at an earlier period? Yes: when he employed a man of business to write the tack, I should have employed one to examine it. Had I done so, I should probably have been guarded against the snare, in which he thinks he has entrapped me. I did believe there must be some flaw in the tack when Mr. Haldane made his demand, and although counsel of the first respectability did not observe any, Mr. Haldane boasts of knowing that it contains no less than three. Did he know this at first, or discover it afterwards? If he discovered it afterwards, would it not be his duty to consider, whether, in a transaction which, he confesses, originated entirely with himself, he should not have held himself bound to rectify the flaws as soon as he discovered them.—In these Letters, he professes to be merely endeavouring to convince me of sin, in this transaction; but, in this passage, he is evidently desirous to inspire me with a sense of danger; and in the last attempt he is much more successful, than in the first. After all that he has said about it, I see nothing wrong in what I have been induced by him to do; but if there be the smallest flaw in the agreement between us, I am abundantly sensible that I am not safe in the hands of Mr. Haldane.

"The monthly collections, not accounted for to me, are "contrary to it." If this be true, Mr. Haldane has betrayed me; for it was he who solicited me to propose to the church here, to follow the example of the churches in Edinburgh as to these monthly collections. I was not aware that he could ask me to adopt a measure, which might enable him afterwards to give me trouble. He confesses (page 52) that he did desire me to make these monthly collections; but the fact does not, in the least, deter him from persisting in his threat. "You must "observe, says he, I am not finding fault with the past, I "am only referring to the future." Unwilling to expose myself to trouble, I have given up these monthly collections, and, in their stead, make extraordinary collections for particular objects, in which the congregation, as well as the church, unite. This united sort of collection is perfectly agreeable to my own principles; but Mr. Haldane exclaims, it is sin. I answer, if it be, it is, in this instance, sin of which he is the author, for he has threatened me out of the only method of making such collections, which he professes to think lawful.

"An assistant Minister, as the agreement provides, would "not suit your ideas."—If the agreement was written with

an upright intention, the phrase, " assistant minister," must refer to such an assistant as I then had, and have had all along, and my right to pay whom, was not only then conveyed to me, but has been practically acknowledged by Mr. Haldane, in settling the annual accompts. In this sense, an assistant minister perfectly suits my ideas.' But if the phrase be capable of any other meaning, which shall occasion me trouble, then I call upon Mr. Haldane, who wrote the agreement with his own hand (see above page 66), either to indemnify me for any damage I may thereby sustain; or to come boldly forward, and say, " I used the phrase on purpose, first to deceive, and " then to entangle you."

He adds—" and you would find yourself bound in the " most express manner, to account for all the different col- " lections, with the exception of occasional ones, made " in " the house, or at the doors" of the Tabernacle." I own it, there is no express provision in the tack, authorizing me to make a collection, either for the poor, or for defraying the expence of communion elements; and so little stress did I ever lay upon the tack, that I never noticed the circumstance, till after reading this letter of Mr. Haldane's. Is he, then, really prepared to lay his hand on the poor's money, and to bring us into trouble for collecting (" in the house" into which we came through his invitation), for the support of the poor, and for the furnishing of ourselves with the means of commemorating the death of Christ? I am obliged, by the bond, while I hold that house, to dispense in it divine ordinances. How can I do this, without calling on the church to make the collection in question, and leaving it when made entirely to the disposal of the deacons of the church? This is precisely what I have all along done, what Mr. Haldane has hitherto acquiesced in, and what, I think, " it would oc- " casion him some trouble" now to dispute.

If, however, I am also deceived in this particular; if I may be brought into trouble for what the poor receive, according to the commandment of Christ; then, certainly, my situation in the Tabernacle is quite untenable. My tack is nugatory. I must yield to Mr. Haldane, and ascribe to him all the honour which may be his due, for outwitting, under a form of law, a man who was acting in the integrity of his heart himself, and never thought of the possibility of being duped by his brother.—On this point, too, Mr. Haldane has not the excuse of differing in opinion with the church, or me, as to the application of those collections. After all,

the bond does not require me to account to Mr. Haldane alone for any thing, but to Mr. Robert Haldane, Mr. James Haldane, Mr. Innes, and myself.

Some may suppose, that my observations on this paragraph are hardly necessary, because Mr. Haldane says, not that he *will*, but that he *might*, give me trouble. But it is equally unchristian and unmanly to use threats, which it would be felt unlawful to execute. I conceive, therefore, that these threats are a warning of what may be expected, in the event of my retaining the Tabernacle. Mr. Haldane frequently disavows all intention of arguing about the bond on legal grounds (at which I cannot wonder in a case in which they are so obviously against him); yet, in this paragraph, he has stooped to a chicanery, worthy only of the stile of the most pettifogging attorney.

Mr. Haldane urges, as another argument for my giving up the Tabernacle, that I have declared it to be high time to change our course in the education of our preachers. "Here," says he (page 16), "you relinquish the plan on which we "set out, and, in contemplation of which, you was put in "possession of the house. One principal branch of it was "this academy taught by yourself, exactly on the footing it "was conducted on when you published your book." When I have enumerated the inaccuracies of this passage, I shall have exhausted its contents. "You relinquish the plan"—the reader has seen above (pages 68, 82, 93), that Mr. Haldane relinquished it. It was in consequence of this, that I called on my brethren to join me in changing our course. "And "now it is publicly recommended to the churches, to lay no "stress upon learning at all—What a monstrous scheme of "ignorance and confusion is this! Is it not high time to "change our course—?" See my Statement, page 57:—"the "plan on which we set out, and in contemplation of which "you was put in possession of the house. One principal "branch of it was this academy taught by yourself." I have produced evidence, in pages 9 and 10, that the scheme of the Tabernacles, when first proposed and agreed to, was perfectly distinct from the seminaries instituted by Mr. Haldane. The proposal of the Tabernacles alone, was made and was agreed to in Edinburgh. In consequence of this agreement, we went to Glasgow, to examine whether the Circus there would answer the purpose of our agreement. Speaking there with candidates for the academy was, on my part, merely an incidental business. Mr. Haldane's own

letter (page 20) tells, "that he had resolved to send a class to "Mr. Bogue, and had settled the matter with him;" and in page 31, he says, "every thing was then equally settled with "him in respect to the class, as with you in regard to the "house, *excepting the formality of being extended in a bond.*" How then could one principal branch of the plan, in contemplation of which I was put in possession of the house, be this academy taught by myself?" Yet, in page 51, he says, "It constituted a fundamental part of my plan; and, in "virtue of your agreement in it, you obtained possession of "the bond." I have shown, pages 9 and 10, that himself has described it as a separate plan. The bond was proposed and promised by Mr. Haldane, when he mentioned to me the scheme of the Tabernacles in Edinburgh. Does he mean to say, that, unless I had agreed to teach the academy, when we afterwards made our journey to Glasgow, he would have broken his promise, and never have suffered me to obtain possession of the bond? It is curious enough too, that in the same letter in which I am told, that one principal branch of the plan on which we set out, was this academy taught by myself, I am accused (pages 20, 21) of breaking up our plan of co-operation by the very act of undertaking to teach it. To the passage in page 51, he adds, "In the preface to the "fourth volume of the Missionary Magazine, you announced "the connection betwixt the class and the Tabernacle." I did so; I simply announced the fact; because a connection had, by that time, taken place between them. But the Tabernacle had been proposed and agreed to, before that connection was formed, and never depended on its formation or continuance. What Mr. Haldane boasts of, then, as "con-"clusive on the subject" of his unjust demand, is founded obviously in misrepresentation. See also above, page 83.

But by far the grossest part of this passage is, that in which he says,—"this academy taught by yourself *exactly on the* "*footing it was conducted on when you published your book.*" After comparing this assertion with what has been seen in pages 93—96, will my readers ever be surprised at any thing which Mr. Haldane may think proper to say on the subject? After I gave up the class, I believe he was once ready enough to declare that he had placed it on a very different footing, (see pages 79—82.) Nor did he ever again suffer it to continue "exactly on the same footing," during the attendance of any one set of students. There was always too much *progress* to admit of stability. But truth has required much more

than this to be stated. While the class was with me, the students were not taught any thing subversive of the faith, order, discipline, and worship, of the churches to which they and their teacher in common belonged. But when Mr. Haldane began privately to interfere in the teaching of the class himself; much more, when I published my book; this academy was conducted NOT "exactly on the same "footing."

He proceeds, "you will never decry the plan of leaving "the class to an individual, exhorting the churches to main- "tain a system of education for themselves, and at the same "time, teach them to continue to be obliged to that individual "for the very houses in which they assemble, by the size of "which, and their freedom from debt, they are enabled to make "such exertions." It was time to decry a plan, by means of which an individual had betrayed us. The injury we have received from him, is no reason why we should give up an accommodation, which contributed to obtain for him, the confidence he abused. It is certainly disagreeable to continue to be obliged to one, who has injured us, and that in a matter of far greater consequence than the one, in which he has obliged us. But it is strange-reasoning, that because we feel one injury, and would guard against the repetition of it, therefore we should consent to submit to another. It will appear from the accompts, that we were more able to have provided for ourselves formerly, than now; and from the state of the times, we could have done it at far less expence. It might have been better for us, therefore, never to have had the house, than now to be deprived of it.—He speaks as if "the breaking of the connection" had been on our part, but it was notoriously on his own. He changed his views, and we were under no obligation, either to follow him without conviction, or to suffer for declining to do it. If it was right to occupy his house, only while we should be of one mind, why have a written agreement at all? In page 33, Mr. Haldane speaks of "the *implied* condition of the bond." This is, in itself, a very extraordinary expression. I do not remember to have met with it before. I have been accustomed to think that law papers were written for this purpose, that nothing might be left to implication, and that every thing, especially conditions, might be expressly and fully stated. But if the bond imply any thing, its very existence implies, that it was an acknowledged principle between us, originally, that the possession of the house ought not to depend on the good will of any individual.

As to "our being enabled to make such exertions," (an expression again reflecting on us for the help which we give to those preachers and churches, whom he has deserted,) I must say, that it is truly shocking to see Mr. Haldane complaining of them. To use language of his own, in another case *, "I proceed on the supposition of what I believe to be "truth, (if I am wrong, I wish to be put right) when I say "that" his measures have been the principal occasion of rendering them necessary; since they have brought many of our brethren into poverty and distress. The preachers, always scantily provided for, have at last been abandoned. The churches have been brought into debt, in consequence of buildings, which Mr. Haldane, at one period, most zealously encouraged them to rear. In one case, on which he knows I spoke to him in vain, the great amount of the debt is owing to compliance with his particular recommendation, that the building should be made unnecessarily large. It was his own conduct that led the churches to borrow from him what they at present owe him; and much has he done to disable them from paying their debt, by frequent removals of the preachers, sending men who scattered congregations, and now insisting that letting seats and making collections are a sin, while at the same moment he begins to tell them, he wants back his money or back his houses. Others gave their money freely, but Mr. Haldane often required the security of "stamped bonds, and legal penalties," which he keeps in his possession to the present hour. Even where the legal interest has been regularly paid him, he has lately demanded payment of the principal. And now it grieves him that a church should exist, which should be "enabled to make such exertions," as tend to relieve their oppressed brethren, to preserve them from absolute bankruptcy and despair.

In page 7, Mr. Haldane says, "A report has been exten-"sively circulated, that I was distressing some of the churches "to whom I had lent money for their houses.—It is not true, "in any shape, nor in one single instance." He adds, "I "have noticed to Mr. Ewing, in one of the letters, that I had "heard he was propagating the above report. I hope he will "not omit to notice this in his reply." I should be sorry to be guilty of such an omission. What may have been extensively circulated, I cannot say; but the report, which I have

* See Letters, page 38.

repeated, is founded in facts which I can establish, if they shall be denied, on the most indubitable evidence. When he says he has heard, that I was propagating an untrue report, I hope he does not mean to insinuate, that I am the author. I have reported nothing, which was not brought to me by persons, whose information and veracity I cannot doubt. Much have I heard, which I do not repeat, because I have been told it in confidence, or because I have not ascertained it, and have no pleasure in hunting after it. When I did repeat what I heard, it was as matter of public notoriety, and with a view to excite sympathy, and to procure assistance, or to put those under my ministry, on their guard against good words and fair speeches, while practice appeared to me to be inconsistent with the first law of Christianity. To this moment I believe all that I have stated above. It is true in all the shapes and instances described by me in the preceding paragraph; and I cannot conceive, on what ground Mr. Haldane's bold denial rests, unless it be the pitiful one of a quibble on the word "distress." When I say Mr. Haldane has been distressing some of the churches, I use the word distress in its ordinary general acceptation, as signifying to reduce to straits, to harass, to make anxious and unhappy. No man, who hears me, imagines I can have any other meaning. I cannot, for a moment, suppose that Mr. Haldane should really understand me in a different sense. I confess, however, that there is a technical sense of the word, a sense in which it will be found in the language of English law, according to which "distress" signifies "the act of "making a legal seizure," and "to distress" signifies "to "prosecute by law to a seizure." In this sense, I certainly am not in the habit of using the word "distress;" nor could I have believed that Mr. Haldane would have affected so to understand me, had he not referred me, in the letter of which he speaks, to a man of business, "who has managed all these concerns for some years past," page 45. I have no occasion to consult that gentleman, for I never alluded to any thing done under his management, but to what was demanded personally by Mr. Haldane himself; and I do think, that his mode of attempting to get himself off, is a strong confirmation of the truth of all that I have said. Although he has not yet, so far as I know, made his demand in a legal form, yet in one of the cases, above alluded to, he surely will not deny, that he said he had some thoughts of desiring (or words to that effect) his man of business to write to the different churches

who had money of him to pay their debt. The very mention of such thoughts, in a single instance, necessarily spread a general alarm. It has distressed the churches, it is still distressing them; and, considering the circumstances of their case, the distress they experience ought to be removed.

Mr. Haldane professes, not to like taking up the dispute between him and me on legal grounds, but to prefer addressing my conscience as a Christian. Let him permit me, in this case, to take the same method with him On legal grounds, I know, that if I should libel him, and he deny the charge, the *onus probandi* must lie upon me. But may I not admonish him as a Christian, that if he were even to baffle my attempts in bringing forward legal evidence to convict him among men, (of which, however, I have not the slightest apprehension, as to any thing stated above); he may, nevertheless, be guilty in the sight of God. Besides, his conduct has, by his own account, given occasion to reproach. A report, he tells us, has been so extensively circulated, that he has received letters about it " from England, and from the " north and south of Ireland, and has heard of it from dif- " ferent parts of Scotland." What I mentioned, with sorrow, to one or two friends, could never produce so vast an effect. This *fama clamosa*, this *violent report*, is not to be met, with a mere blunt denial, nor yet with a challenge to one who never raised it, and who is merely one of the many who believe it, to prove what he has said. For the sake of the peace of the churches, and of the credit of the gospel, some voluntary, candid, distinct, satisfactory, explanation ought surely to be made. Instead of this, however, we have only the following obscure and ominous intimation. " What it " shall henceforth be my duty to do in regard to houses that " belong to me, and the money that I have lent for such pur- " poses, I shall endeavour fully to consider, and to decide " I trust in the fear of God."

While Mr. Haldane admits, (page 17,) " that the idea " of putting the house into my possession originated wholly " with himself, and was not solicited by me," he exculpates me from all blame in the transaction. To have solicited the use of property from him, or any man, would have indeed been a most dishonourable attempt. On the other hand, after coming forward with the proposal that I should use this property, and that I should do it on the express condition of being entitled to continue to use it as long as I pleased; after using every possible means to recommend

his proposal to my acceptance; after succeeding in his recommendation of it, and professing satisfaction in that success for many years; it is an attempt equally dishonourable in Mr. Haldane to say a single word, to persuade, to provoke, or to compel me to part with it, contrary to the conviction of my own mind.—" It was designed," he says, " to promote the kingdom of the Redeemer." So say I; and, therefore, I oppose those, who appear to me to be " speaking " perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."—" I " am now convinced," he says, " that it is operating power- " fully in the contrary direction." I have no ground for boasting, but I must say, I am not so convinced.—What he says about my helping those churches, " whose sentiments " and practice correspond with my own," is exactly what he does himself, and what, I suppose, is done, more or less strictly, by every body. If it be a temptation to other churches, to help those with whom we are agreed; it must be, at least, equally a temptation, to harass those from whom we differ.—" As you are publicly retracting what you call your " errors; so I feel myself at liberty to look for the restoration " of this property." And I feel myself at liberty to disapprove of his looking for it, because I do not hold this property on any claim of infallibility, and because I am retracting no errors but such as were committed, AFTER the time when I received it. —" I received from you no equivalent for it." He received from me my co-operation in the scheme of opening Tabernacles in the principal towns of Scotland.—" The purpose " for which I gave it is now defeated." The *professed* purpose for which he gave it has been uniformly pursued, and is pursued still, in a dependence on the divine blessing.— " I feel too the situation in which I am placed with you in " regard to money accounts, and in other respects, exceed- " ingly disagreeable." So do I: what I have proposed with a view to our mutual accommodation, and how Mr. Haldane has treated my proposal, shall be afterwards stated.—" You " certainly are at liberty to follow out your own views; but " opposed as they are to mine, it would be improper in you " to do so with my means." He expected me, then, to hold myself obliged to follow him in every opinion he might choose to adopt. Never before did he presume to hint this expectation. The *use* of the Tabernacle is not *his* means: it is *my* means. It became as really my means, by our agreement respecting it, as the *property* of the Tabernacle continues to be his means, under the burden of my right to use

it.—" I can never suppose that, all things considered, you " would choose to continue on the footing in which you " now stand in that house, or that you would advise your " church to do so." Of what I may choose to do, or to advise others to do, I beg leave to exercise the undoubted right of judging for myself.—" Independent too, of other " considerations, *all the advantages which you could reasonably* " *desire from this transaction, you have already obtained.*" From this transaction I desired a more enlarged propagation of the gospel in the principal towns of Scotland. This advantage I enjoyed for a time. But I have not already obtained all that I could reasonably desire of it. Instead of this, the other Tabernacles have already been turned from their original destination, (which has been shown above, page 9, to be a breach of engagement to ALL the parties concerned,) and the one in Glasgow is also demanded.—" It was an open door " to you." These words add insult to injury. I wanted no " open door" from any man. Mr. Haldane was quite as much obliged to me, as I was to him, and he always professed to be so, till he wanted to get rid of me.—" You " have enjoyed possession of it for ten years." But I am entitled, if I please, to possess it for life.—" You are *now* " well known." Was I *then* unknown?—" You have *now* " extensive connections." Was I *then* destitute of connections?—" And a numerous church which ought to provide " for itself." It might have done so, long before this time, had not Mr. Haldane used means to make them believe they had only to assist in providing for others.—" At any rate it " is incumbent on you as well as on me, to renounce what " at the beginning was *unlawful* in itself, has been all along " wrong, and also accompanied with many evils." Has Mr. Haldane then renounced this transaction? By no means. All that he has renounced is the obligation of the agreement: its privileges he retains. Now the doctrine of Scripture, on such a case, is the very reverse. If an agreement between men has been made, which one of the parties afterwards thinks unlawful, he may and ought to renounce its privileges, but its obligation he cannot renounce without the consent of the other party. No case can be stronger than that of Israel and the Gibeonites, Joshua ix. In that case, the league was obtained by craft, yet it was binding. In this case, the agreement originated entirely with the party, who now seeks to break it. How different his behaviour from that described Psalm xv. 4. " he that sweareth to his own hurt, and

" changeth not!"—" We must confess the '*rottenness of the* " '*whole scheme*,' the expression emphatically used by your- " self in reference to it." This expression, he says, at page 24, I used when it was brought to my view, that when I wished Mr. Haldane to renounce *his right*, I did not propose to give up *my right*. To this remark I have replied in a preceding part of my narrative, [see page 59]. As to the words, " the rottenness of the whole scheme;" in a conversation, which lasted about four hours, and took place above a twelvemonth ago, I cannot say whether I used them or not. But I do most confidently deny, that I, then, or at any other time, used such words, " in reference to" our agreement about the Tabernacle. I could have used no such words, in reference to that subject, without the strongest consciousness of speaking falsely, for the incredible purpose of condemning myself, in that which I continued to maintain. The unfair use which Mr. Haldane has repeatedly made of this expression, which, he alleges, I used in our private conversation at Glasgow, but which, if I did use it, I am certain I must have done, " in reference to" some other subject; confirmed me in the belief of the complaints made by the brethren at Edinburgh, both of his mode of conducting private conversations, and of the use he could afterwards make of them. It also confirmed me, in declining all further conversation with him, except in the presence of witnesses.

That part of Mr. Haldane's letter, which regards my late behaviour to him, has already been answered *. To fasten on me the charge of an improper spirit, he says, page 20, " I am informed, that, at this moment, there are two " reputed Christians, with whom you are not on speaking " terms. One of them even belongs to a church with which " you are in close union." I conceive every Christian reader will be sensible, that the information here alleged, could be given to Mr. Haldane, and retailed by him to the public, from no other motive than a desire to vilify my character, and cause alienation of affection from me, in a church with which I am in close union. In the present state of the world, and of the churches, a Christian, and especially a Christian Minister, will probably meet with various individuals, in the course of his experience, whom he must " mark," and " avoid," Rom. xvi. 17.—2 Thes. iii. 14, 15. But as the parties more immediately concerned in any case of this kind,

* See pages 103—107.

have brought no charge against me; I think it sufficient to say (which I can do with great truth) that when I am not on speaking terms with a reputed Christian, I am acting, to the best of my judgement, in " submission to Jesus Christ," in obedience " to a fundamental law of his kingdom." I am confident also, that, in similar circumstances, I should prefer being treated in this way by others. I have much greater respect for the man, who shows me that I have offended him, than for the man who hides his resentment for years, under the garb of plausibility, and treasures up my unsuspecting words and actions to be brought out against me, when occasion may require, while he will smile, and smile to the very last.—Mr. Haldane complains, in page 49, of being " placed " in a situation with me, in which he never stood before " with any other man." Is this, indeed, the case? Possibly it may, yet I did not before understand it to be so.

The concluding paragraph has been answered in page 27. The story about Mr. Bogue, has been shown to be founded in misrepresentation. The introduction of it now for the first time, after the lapse of so many years, appears to me to have no possible object, except the hopeless one, I trust, of sowing dissension between two, who are equally grieved, I believe, with Mr. Haldane's present behaviour. In this place, he speaks of " conceding" the disposal of his talents. To concede, supposes that something has been demanded, or requested, or at least proposed. But upon none of these suppositions is the word applicable to the transaction between Mr. Haldane and me.—He asks, " What would you have " said, had you heard that Mr. Bogue was gone to London " to consult lawyers, whether he could compel me to adhere " to the first design; and that he intended to avail himself " of a right to enforce the continuance of a constrained " co-operation?" In such a case, I can easily imagine what I would have said. I would have said, " What! has Mr. Bogue " received a right to teach the class? then, certainly, you " must let him enjoy his right, or indemnify him for the loss " of it. Have you given a right, and do you now seek to " take it away? The attempt is infamous! Mr. Bogue is " well entitled to consult lawyers, or any body else, whom " he thinks proper; and it is inexcuseable in you to put him " to so much trouble." Such, I am confident, would have been my language to Mr. Haldane, in the case he supposes; and if he had made the smallest attempt to set aside the obligations of good faith, by Jesuitical reasoning, our inter-

course would most assuredly have been broken off, at an earlier period. After all, the name of Mr. Bogue has been unnecessarily introduced, to give plausibility to the false charge, that I was the first to break up the co-operation. Mr. Haldane, Mr. Bogue, Mr. Innes, and I, were the parties engaged to co-operate in the mission to India. But that connection ceased with the scheme to which it belonged. The parties associated for opening the Tabernacles in Scotland, were, as appears from the tack of the Tabernacle, and from Mr. Haldane's own account in his Address to the Public, Mr. Robert Haldane, Mr. James Haldane, Mr. Innes, and I, see above, pages 8 and 9. In a note, page 21, Mr. Haldane says, "I am sorry, that I am obliged to mention his (Mr. Bogue's) "name in this business; but circumstances compel me." It is far-fetched compulsion.——"Part of the above will, I believe, be new to him." Equally new was part of it to me.—I have only to add, that, I hope, the plea of compelling circumstances, which is made with greater reason, will be admitted on my behalf, for the publication of the letter, in which Mr. Haldane had formerly introduced Mr. Bogue's name [see above, page 56], and which, I cannot doubt, contains much that is new to him indeed!

In his letter of August 12th, 1808 [Letters, page 22], Mr. Haldane says, "*in a religious connection or co-operation, every "thing ought to be free from first to last.*" This was precisely the case with our religious connection and co-operation. It was voluntary in its commencement, and in its continuance, and no contract between us, interfered with our liberty of conscience, when it at last came to an end. It has already been shown, that our agreement about the Tabernacle, though rising out of our religious connection, was, from the beginning, mutually acknowledged to be a business of a different nature [see above, page 155]. A right to occupy a house, for whatever purpose, is a temporal right. As such, it was very properly ascertained and secured, as other temporal rights are.

He says, in page 24, "When some in your church pro-"posed that Mr. Wardlaw should be chosen your co-pastor, "you pleaded, as an objection, the arrangement between "you and me concerning the house, and the plan was quashed "by you." On reading this sentence, my own recollection enabled me to remember two persons only, who had made this proposal. On inquiry, it has been brought to my remembrance, that two others called on me with the same view.

I know, however, that the proposal was never the general desire of the church, but that a number of Mr. Wardlaw's particular friends preferred the formation of another church; and, it is known generally, that some did not join the communion till another church was formed. I had, and I stated, various reasons for declining a colleague. One of them certainly was, the agreement respecting the house. After what the reader has seen of my conflict with Mr. Haldane, about that agreement, previously to the formation of the church, he will not wonder that this should have been the case. He will be sensible, at the same time, that I could not have been explicit on the point, without divulging a quarrel, which I then hoped might have been buried in oblivion. One of the persons mentioned above, has lately told me, that he was not satisfied with the conversation which we had on the subject. He never told me this before. Mr. Haldane highly approved of all that I did in that affair, when he first heard it; nor did he ever change his tone respecting it to me, before the writing of this letter. After condemning the whole now, he adds, "My "only consolation regarding them is, that in what I did, I "acted with integrity." Were he disposed to act with integrity still, I presume he would speak plainly out, and say, whether, by this form of speech, he means any reflection on my integrity. I cannot but congratulate myself on having contributed to prevent my esteemed brother, from being entangled in so embarrassing a connection. However mortifying it may be to Mr. Haldane, that one of the churches in Glasgow is entirely out of his power, I am sure Mr. Wardlaw, and all his friends, will join me in thinking it very providential, that this is their happy situation.

In full corroboration, he says, of what he has advanced against the bond, he makes a large quotation (pages 26—29) from a paper of mine on vows, in the Missionary Magazine for January, 1804. It seems to me, that he should have had the fairness to have given the first sentence of his quotation fully, as I wrote it. "A vow was a promise, or solemn "engagement, under the form of an oath; at least an impre- "cation was always implied, in case of failure of perform- "ance." By cutting off the end of this sentence, pointing the mutilated remainder with a full stop, as if it had been a whole, marking the words, "*a promise or solemn engagement*," in italics, and omitting the whole illustration that follows, he tries to conceal the fact, that I am speaking of promises *made to God*, under a *religious* penalty, and vindicating the refusal

or renunciation of them, when unwarrantably required by men. This subject surely is quite distinct from promises or solemn engagements between man and man. Whether I be right or wrong in my paper on vows, I have said nothing contrary to our Lord's declaration, that "the weightier "matters of the law are JUSTICE, mercy, and FIDELITY." Mat. xxiii. 23. The Apostle's remark, Gal. iii. 15. respecting a man's covenant, that, "if it be confirmed, no man dis- "annulleth, or addeth thereto," I declare to be "perfectly "just," if that covenant be legal; which Mr. Haldane allows to be the case in the covenant between us. His perverted application of my doctrine on vows, would make void, through its subtlety, the very ordinance of marriage, which our Lord has so beautifully restored to its original obligation, Mat. xix. 3—10. It would directly contradict the Apostle's instructions, 1 Cor. vii. 10—17. to the husband, or the wife, who has an unbelieving companion. The Apostle says, "Let not the wife depart from her husband," and, "Let not the husband put away his wife." The case here referred to by the Apostle, is, no doubt, that of a Christian, who had married, before conversion, a fellow heathen. But many Christians, even after conversion, no more understand the duty of confining their choice in marriage to a fellow Christian, than Mr. Haldane professes to have done what he now calls "the unscriptural transaction "of the bond." In such cases, then, Mr. Haldane, in order to be consistent, should be prepared to break the most sacred bands of civil society. He should advise the husband to say, "I married you in ignorance. I now see, that a "Christian should marry only in the Lord. My error is "detected, my liberty is therefore proclaimed, and I am "bound to assert it. My engagement was a sinful one; it "demands repentance, not fulfilment." Nay, even in the case of a fellow Christian, who should be constrained by religious scruples, to leave a changed communion, to which that Christian's partner in life adhered, Mr. Haldane would be directly led, by his reasoning against me, to say, "I mar- "ried you as one willing and desirous to carry on that plan "of reformation on which, although I was at first far from "fully comprehending it, and, therefore, am sensible I was "often counteracting the design, I have invariably proceeded "to this hour. You have been guilty of a remarkable "tergiversation. You refuse the practice, and abandon the "principles. If, then, it is now demonstrated, that you

" never understood, or have not adhered to the principles " on which I became yours; that you find I was deceived " in regard to you, although I most readily admit you did " not intend to deceive; will you, after this, take a legal " advantage, and retain my person? It is impossible. Will " you, after this, speak of my immorality in demanding it " back? To yourself be the wrong, if you so speak. *You* " *are bound, on the principles of common honesty, to restore me to* " *freedom.*"

The attempt made, in Letters, page 29, to misapply some aphorisms of mine to the manner in which I am supported in preaching the gospel, has been answered above, page 159. I firmly adhere to the aphorisms in every legitimate application.

He believes, he says, page 30, that my aphorisms and my paper on vows, were both written with a view to the Established Church. In this he is mistaken. The evils opposed in both, are to be found in many other communions.—He adds a most important sentiment: " It is well to call upon " others to come out of Babylon, but it is our first duty to " extricate ourselves." It will be a happy thing for Mr. Haldane, and those at present in communion with him, if this first duty shall be included in that plan of reformation, on which he invariably proceeds. It is to be feared that some can see nothing of Babylon, unless they be looking at the tower, the temple, or the palace and hanging gardens. To me, one of the most wonderful circumstances of that symbolical city, has ever been its prodigious extent. It is said to have had large spaces within its walls, which were never occupied with buildings, where corn grew, and things had much the appearance of the country. Might not some then be fast locked up within the brazen gates, while they flattered themselves, and one another, with a supposed emancipation? Besides, there was not only the city, but the empire of Babylon. Wherever Nebuchadnezzar bore rule, wherever Nebuzaradan was captain of the guard; there was captivity, and there was Babylon.

In the conclusion of this letter, page 30, he says, " all " connection, except in the house, has been broken, which " also *you proposed long before it happened, if others would have* " *agreed to it.*" I suppose Mr. Haldane alludes here to an opinion, which I expressed in a letter to Mr. Aikman, *after* Mr. Haldane was walking disorderly, but *before* Mr. Aikman had withdrawn from him. On inquiring, I find that Mr. Aik-

man understands the passage in the same way. His remarks on it I transcribe: "As to your proposing a separation, if "others, &c. I know well to what Mr. H. refers, and you "can fully meet him *here* upon his own ground. The fact "is, Mr. H. had virtually separated—or ought to have been "separated, for his schism at Newcastle. A sinful respect "of persons prevented his brother, as I believe, and certainly "prevented myself, from making that business a matter of "discipline. This I fully stated to himself, and it might "be at that time that I also mentioned that your mind was "so much hurt, that you judged separation a duty. In "this, I think, you judged right, excepting that we should "have called him previously to repentance *. My forbear- "ance, I am now convinced, was quite inconsistent with "fidelity, either to Mr. H. or to the church. And, upon "this subject, I gave the fullest explanation to our own "church, at the time of the separation."

In the postscript to this letter, page 31, Mr. Haldane makes an apology, which, in a note, he says, he sees was unnecessary. It is by no means material to the main question, whether it should have been made or not. But his reason for calling it unnecessary cannot be well founded. He says, "When I requested Mr. Ewing to converse with me about "the business of the Tabernacle, I did not anticipate that he "would refuse to do so." I am unable to admit this, because I had, when in Edinburgh, declared to him, in writing, (see above, page 104,) that, "in present circumstances, I "thought it my duty to require," that witnesses should be present. Those circumstances had not altered, when he requested the conversation at Glasgow; and though he said, at Glasgow, that he wanted to speak about other things than at Edinburgh, it appears from his late publication, that the subject was to have been the same: see above, page 122.

Having been so full in my answer to the two first long letters, it will not be necessary to go minutely over the rest, which have, in many parts, been answered already, and abound in repetition.—In reply to Mr. Haldane's complaint, that he felt his situation with me, in regard to money accounts, and in other respects, exceedingly disagreeable, (in which I could truly join with him,) I alluded in page 180, to something which I had proposed with a view to our mutual accommodation. This was a proposal, to which I consented

* This remark I fully admit, and think I can have said nothing against it.

at the suggestion of friends, that while I retained my right of occupancy, I should buy the house for behoof of the church. In this way Mr. Haldane would have escaped the guilt of breaking his agreement, as well as the disagreeable intercourse of settling accompts, while my friends and I would have gone far towards a compliance with his old demands, and have made a very considerable sacrifice, for the sake of peace. I had not the credit of suggesting this proposal, and I had no expectation that it would be pleasantly accepted. At the same time, I was willing that any attempt of a conciliatory nature should be made, which did not imply the admission of unjust claims and unfounded charges. Accordingly, with my consent, Mr. Harley wrote the letter, which Mr. Haldane mentions in his letters, page 32, and a copy of which I here insert.

Glasgow, 17th August, 1803.

My Dear Sir,

When I look back upon the first meeting I had with Mr. Ewing and you, and the happy season that succeeded, when by united zeal and talents, the gospel was preached to thousands who never heard it before, and when I compare those days with the present state of things, I am grieved to the heart. "How is the gold become dim, and "the most fine gold changed!"

Methinks the streets and highways where sinners were called and converted by the gospel, will witness against the present indifference to the conversion of sinners, and the zeal manifested for those things that gender strife, rather than godly edifying.

It gave me much concern to hear of the disagreeable meeting you had with Mr. Ewing, last time you was here. I do not wish to enter into the merits of the misunderstanding betwixt you, but cannot help regretting that you should have told him, he had no right now to retain the Tabernacle.

This led Mr. Ewing, with the concurrence of his friends, to take legal advice about the validity of the tack. Many, both here and in Edinburgh, feel much interested in his behalf; and, as far as I can learn, there is but one opinion upon the subject, namely, that the tack is good, consistent both with law and equity; and that it is the duty of Mr. E. to hold it for the purpose therein specified, the more so as the relinquishing of it might be injurious to the spread of the gospel. Were it now at your disposal, it is thought it would

soon be turned to another purpose. Indeed, upon your principles, there would be no need for such a house. I cannot, therefore, conceive for what purpose you wished Mr. Ewing to give it up, unless you intended to sell the property, in order to apply the proceeds otherwise. I must here remark, that it was surely very impolitic in you making such a demand, as it will very much hurt the funds of the house. There is now such a prejudice against you and your measures, that I am afraid there will be a short-coming instead of a surplus. I hope you will excuse me for being so very free and faithful. As matters stand, it occurs to me, that the best way to settle the business, would be for you to sell the house, for the behoof of the church, provided they should be able to make the purchase; but the present state of trade and manufactures is much against such a transaction.

The size of the house is also a bar in the way. If Mr. E. was removed, I am afraid the congregation would dwindle away, and it would be a heavy burden to the church. However, if you think well of this proposal, you might mention the price and terms of payment, &c. I will let you know as soon as I can, if there is any probability of our being able to make the purchase. I know some will object on this ground, that we are sure of accommodation during Mr. Ewing's stay, and if he was leaving us, we could not wish such a large house, &c. In valuing the property you will, no doubt, deduct what you reckon the value of the lease, and the balance would be the sum paid you.

I thought it my duty to write. You may send an answer or not as you think fit. I hope Mrs. Haldane is well. I have a sincere regard for you both, but I am truly sorry I cannot, as formerly, wish you God speed. I am,

DEAR SIR,

Yours truly,

(Signed) W. HARLEY.

In the beginning of Mr. Haldane's letter to me, of August 27th, 1808, he says, that Mr. Harley has "very improperly "termed the tenure by which I hold the Tabernacle a lease." In a note, he professes to lay no stress on the legal distinction between a tack or lease, and a bond, but wishes merely to keep in view, that it is a gratuitous obligation. It will be seen, however, that he thinks it worth while to argue the matter in his letter to Mr. Harley, which shall be afterwards

produced. That it is not a gratuitous obligation, I have already shown; see above, page 156. Were I inclined to argue, like Mr. Haldane, on legal grounds, I might here refer to my counsel, who says, "I am of opinion, that the deed "here referred to, is a good and valid tack or contract," see above page 141. I might also quote what a friend, very well acquainted with law, remarked to me on the subject; "I see "his drift, said he, in preferring the term bond to that of "lease for the deed you hold. The writer of it, however, "who we must suppose, understood the nature of it, would "have used a different stamp, if he had meant to give it the "effect of a bond. I hope your mind is now fortified against "the insinuation he intends by this; he can hurt you by it in "no shape." For my own part, I know nothing about all this; but if it be really so, that the stamp ascertains what the man of business understood to have been the original intention of parties, I hope this will not be objected to it as an "unscriptural" quality, because one of them may have since changed his mind.

But, on this point, as well as all the other points between us, I prefer departing from legal grounds, and proceeding solely on the principles of equity and of the gospel. I shall only, therefore, remind the reader, that wherever Mr. Haldane mentions this deed, in his own letters, before he wanted to get rid of it, he uniformly uses such language as he now calls "very improper." Thus, in page 55 above, it is called a "CONTRACT," in page 52, "A SOLEMN CONTRACT," and in page 66, where it occurs in a letter of business, it is called "the TACK of the Tabernacle." I never knew him call this paper a BOND, so far as I remember, before reading the Letters which he lately published. Now, as both ways of speaking cannot be right, I leave this plain question to the consideration of my readers, "Whether is it in the period "preceding, or in that following, his demand of the house, "that Mr. Haldane's language has been calculated to deceive "me?"

At the foot of page 33, he says, "I should willingly allow "a certain time, on terms that might be arranged, for you to "provide yourselves in a house." Really after what has come upon me, in consequence of *terms that have been arranged* between Mr. Haldane and me, I must be allowed to say, that I have little courage for any attempt at another arrangement with him. If it be the will of Providence that I should be honoured any longer to preach the gospel; accommodation, I

trust, will be procured elsewhere, with some hope of tranquillity: if I may not enjoy this honour; " behold, here am " I, let the Lord do to me as seemeth good unto him."

Mr. Haldane takes an opportunity, page 34, of adverting a little to my book on Church Government. His first objection is brought against the manner in which it is written; of which, on account of levity, asperity, and personality, he thinks I have need deeply to repent.—As to the charge of levity, I can truly say, that I was conscious of no want of serious concern, as to the dispute itself, or as to my view of the temper and conduct of those, who had moved it. Some of the opinions, which have been urged on us, do certainly appear to me, to be not only erroneous, but ridiculous. I heartily agree, that ridicule is not the test of truth, but that truth is the test of ridicule. I have deceived myself, therefore, if I have, in any part of my book, attempted to treat any thing with ridicule, which I did not think I had already shown to be unsupported by Scripture. After doing this, I conceive ridicule to be a warrantable method of exploding error. It is sanctioned by Elijah's address to the priests of Baal, 1 Kings xviii. 27. and by Isaiah's description of the worship of idols, chap. xliv. 12—17. The proportion of ridicule, which shall appear in a particular debate, may be as much owing to the quantity of ridiculous matter that is opposed, as to the temper of him who opposes it. In his Letters, page 44, he says, " Your ridicule on such a subject is en- " tirely misplaced, and I believe, universally condemned." I think he must be sensible, that he has here asserted what is contrary to fact. He can hardly be ignorant, that several, whose opinion it would be presumption to despise, have publicly approved of my Statement, and particularly of the spirit and style in which it is written.—As to the alleged asperity of my style, I certainly wrote with the most heart-felt vexation; with the most decided disapprobation both of the principles urged on us, and of the manner in which they were urged; and with the most eager desire to avert a danger so far advanced, and of so formidable a nature. I expressed the feelings of my heart. If any one suppose a want of love in my style, they little know how often love even increases the sharpness of expostulation; and how much, at the same time, my love led me to cover, which justice would have permitted me to disclose. Some idea of this last consideration may be formed now, from what I am compelled to lay before the public in the present publication.—As to what is complained

of under the name of personalities, I hope no allusion will be found in my book to any thing personal, which can fairly be considered as of a private nature. Besides the abstract investigation of truth, the state of the churches seemed to require me, as a member, and an overseer, to investigate, and to point out, the causes which had given such prevalence to opinions, which I conceive to be too obviously erroneous to have so far forced their own way. Knowing, as I did, that many of those causes had arisen, not from the merits of any question, but from the practices and adventitious circumstances of individuals, I felt it my duty to allude to these, as well as to the opinions themselves, to put my brethren on their guard. I did so, " with a desire to be faithful, but to offend no man." In doing so, I think I have acted a more honourable, and more friendly part, towards all concerned, in distinctly referring to undeniable facts; than if I had indulged in those indiscriminate revilings of whole bodies of men, which so strongly characterise most of the publications I have opposed. I think also, that, in alluding to the principles and practices of known characters, without naming them, I am justified by many examples in the word of God: See 1 Cor. v. chapter throughout, chap. xv. 12. 2 Cor. ii. 5—8. chap. x. 2, 10, 11. chap. xi. 4, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23. 2 Pet. ii. 10—22. and Jude 4—16.

Men seldom appear to be good judges of the qualities of style in any controversy, in which they are themselves involved. I freely confess, that I think the most acrimonious pamphlet I ever wrote, was my Animadversions on the work of Mr. Robertson of Cambuslang. Besides my disapprobation of the work itself, I wrote under the influence of great alarm; for my late kind and worthy friend Mr. Dale had, just at that time, shown me the draught of a bill, which was intended to be brought into Parliament, in order to prohibit all itinerant preaching whatsoever, without a licence, to be applied for to a Magistrate or Justice of Peace, in each place to which the preacher might go. Such a bill, I thought Mr. Robertson's book, but too well calculated to vindicate; and what some, I believe, have thought to be bitter exaggeration, was nothing more than the actual apprehension of my mind. It has been seen above, however, that Mr. Haldane, after giving me the best advice on the subject of the spirit of that publication in page 35, expresses himself with approbation of the spirit of it in page 37; nor can I recollect that he ever blamed me for levity, asperity, or personality, till my remarks inter-

fered with the success of his own opinions.—On the other hand, I acknowledge, that I am less fit to judge of my own style than an impartial public, to whom, after all that I have said, it may seem, that I have been too severe; and, perhaps, as is very often the case, that there has been, and still is, too much heat on both sides. I can only say, that I feel my danger, and that it is, at this time, my daily prayer, and endeavour, to avoid it.

In page 56 of my attempted Statement on Church Government, I have said, "*When many churches were* FORMING "in this country, it seemed so desireable speedily to procure "a number of labourers, that we were tempted to act, as if "we wished to ascertain by experiment, how little prepara- "tion would answer the exigency." Because, "*there was* "*not one church* FORMED," when the "length of the course," for the first class, "was fixed," Mr. Haldane is "concerned "to say, I have not adhered to fact:" see Letters, pages 34, 35. Now to me, a thing seems to be forming, when a preparation has commenced for its accomplishment. Such a preparation for the existence of churches in our connection, appears to me, to have taken place in this country, at least as early as the year 1797, in the autumn of which, Messrs. Haldane, Aikman, and Rate, made their first tour. But, according to Mr. Haldane's own account, in his Address to the Public, page 82, it was "in England, or before he "went there with Mr. Hill, in the year 1798, (he forgets "which,) that he conceived the idea" of the education of preachers. I think, therefore, that my supposed deviation from fact, is one of those misapprehensions into which men are apt to fall, when they criticise in the warmth of irritation. I have no wish, however, to contend for a phrase, which is of no moment whatever in my Statement. If it be more agreeable to Mr. Haldane, I am willing to alter it, and to say, "When the great object was to propagate the gospel at "home, it seemed so desirable, &c." The rest of the paragraph will be in no wise affected by the change.

He asks me why, instead of that paragraph in page 56, I did "not rather state, in the clearest manner, *my decided* "*change* on this subject?" Because I thought it more convenient to state it in page 57, which I have accordingly done. I am asked, "why I have hinted in page 57, that I, from "the beginning, acted in hope that our plan would be "extended, in point of time of preparation?" I hinted, or rather directly asserted, this, because it is true. Mr. Haldane

encouraged me, from the beginning, to entertain this hope; and I considered his lengthening the duration of the course, of the first and second classes, as a step towards the accomplishment of it. The speech which Mr. Haldane puts into my mouth, when conversing with the candidates for the class, in the end of 1798, viz. that fifteen months "*was enough for* "*them, and if that was not sufficient, they were unfit for the* "*work*," could hardly have been spoken by me. It is quite contrary to the strain in which I speak of learning in my Animadversions on Mr. Robertson, which were published in March 1800, see pages 31, 32. I might say, "if fifteen "months was not sufficient, they were unfit *for the class*, (meaning that, unless they possessed a certain degree of previous cultivation, they were not qualified to profit by our then so limited a course;) but, though I pretend to no recollection of words on the subject, at this distance of time, I am certain I could never say, they were unfit *for the work* [as if I meant the work of preaching the gospel;) for I never was disposed to maintain, that a man's fitness for preaching must depend on the sufficiency of fifteen months for his education.

The next thing, not already noticed, in Mr. Haldane's Letters, is the chasm in page 37. This chasm, I think it necessary to supply, because I have certain information, that there was no chasm in the letter of November 15th, 1808, (Letters, page 50,) when it was handed about in Glasgow, and I have no reason to think that there was, at that time, any chasm in the one letter more than in the other. Private whispers are worse than public accusation. Both passages, therefore, must here appear at full length, that both may be answered.—"If I mistake not, you have made an allusion "in your book to my conversing with the students in private. "I did so, at different times, on the subjects which have been "agitated, which are certainly of no trifling concern to the "people of God. As I had a deep interest in them, and "was supporting them, I considered, and do still consider, "that it was my duty to do so. If I have erred in regard to "the classes, it has been in neglecting this too much, not in "doing it too often. I rather wonder, however, that you "have introduced this subject in the way you have done, "when I recollect the information I received in your presence, "of the manner in which you managed, in regard to the "English students at Glasgow, to inculcate on them your "views of the gospel and of faith. You invited them often "to your house for the purpose, but you was cautious not to "say much at first, lest their prejudices should be excited."

The passage in my Statement, in which Mr. Haldane thinks himself alluded to, is, I suppose, the paragraph in page 214. In my opinion, it will apply to many parts of his conduct, besides that which regarded his conversing with the students in private; yet it will be evident to every one who reads it with attention, that I had in view a much more extensive application than to any individual, or any one denomination of Christians. My opinion of Mr. Haldane's private conversations with the students, (which is not affected by the plea, that "he was supporting them,") has already been stated: see above, pages 93—96. For the benefit of those who are in the habit of accepting his hospitality, it may be proper to mention, that what he here says of information, received in my presence, is an allusion to words spoken in my presence by my wife, when we were on a visit to Mr. Haldane. I cannot exactly repeat them, but I distinctly remember, and am joined by her in asserting, that, besides being misrepresented, they were used for a purpose *directly contrary* to that which is here alleged. Mr. Haldane had been inquiring about the sentiments of the gentlemen in question, and was asking Mrs. Ewing, if I had not many conversations with them. Her reply was to this effect, that, though they were often with us, I never thought of raising disputes on those points on which we might differ, because I knew, that my sentiments must sufficiently appear from my preaching, and from the general strain of my conversation; and I thought it was better, that people should be left, without disturbance, to judge for themselves. This is, indeed, my usual practice with all who visit me. To say, then, that I was represented as "*managing*, in order to inculcate my views;" as "inviting "students often to my house *for the purpose;*" but as "being "*cautious* not to say much at first;"—is most grossly to pervert a confidential conversation, the meaning of which, especially in the connection in which the words were used, could not have easily been misunderstood. I am sure the gentlemen referred to must be very much amused, when they see the account, alleged by Mr. Haldane, to have been given in my presence, of the purpose for which, I occasionally seek the pleasure of their company. I think they will give me credit for all the caution here ascribed to me, both at first and at last.

In his Letters, page 37, Mr. Haldane is surprised, that I found fault with his going, in the manner he did, to Newcastle, without consulting the church at Edinburgh; "because,"

says he, "I had before explained the matter to yourself." Yes; but he knows, that I did not admit his explanation to be satisfactory.—Page 38, "You wish to find the churches "consulted in fitting men for the work of the ministry. But "was this ever done, or did you ever propose it during all "the time that the classes were under your care?"—The classes under my care, had been formed before the church was formed *. It could not, therefore, be consulted respecting them, as the plan of their education was fixed from the beginning. From the Memorial, in page 83, and the Letters, pages 86—91, it will appear when I proposed consulting the churches on this subject, and who resisted the proposal.—He asks, if I did not act contrary to my professed principle, when I published my Statement, without consulting any one? I did not consult any one, as I explained in that book, page 208, that I alone might bear the blame. Does it grieve Mr. Haldane, that he cannot take occasion from it, to molest any besides myself?—What he calls "my professed principle," he says, that he also fully recognises [see Letters, page 37]. To publish a book, then, involving the general interests of the gospel, without consulting a church, cannot be, in his judgement, contrary to this principle, for his last publication was got ready, as I have been informed, with the most anxious secrecy.

In his Letters, page 39, Mr. Haldane accuses me of ascribing many of the opinions he now holds to the love of change. "Here," says he, "is the very charge which the world so "loudly vociferated against us all, when you left the Church "of Scotland." He does not, however, refer to the particular passages. In this I commend his prudence. If he had referred to page 181, or to pages 213—216 of my Statement, it would have been seen at once, that his attempt to identify my remarks with the charge brought against us, when we left the church of Scotland, and to represent both as equally groundless, was altogether absurd.

Several of his attempts to fasten the charge of fickleness on me, have already been noticed. This part of his Letters appears to me, decisively to manifest a malicious spirit. I can, in no other way, account for his saying, in page 42, that I "used to speak of the ministers, with whom I formerly "associated, in terms both of ridicule and censure." The evident intention of these words is, to excite an incurable

* See above, pages 10, 35.

jealousy of me, in the minds of my former associates. Having so fully obtained my confidence, for a time, he may, no doubt, give any colouring he pleases to my private conversation. At the distance of nearly ten years, I cannot be very particular as to the terms which I used, more especially as I little knew that I was watched for future accusation. But I hope, that, notwithstanding Mr. Haldane's allegations, many, both of my former, and of my present, associates, will believe me, when I declare, that I am not conscious of having betrayed the confidence, which any man ever reposed in me. After reading this pamphlet, Mr. Haldane will be sensible, whether he shall acknowledge it or not, that I have not betrayed even his confidence; for I faithfully abstain from all statements, which he has not himself made necessary by his own publication. Had I ever used terms, which he thought improper, respecting my former associates, he was bound in duty to have reproved me. But I imagine, he will hardly venture to say, that he did so, on any one occasion.—The only other particular, in this part of the Letters, on which I shall animadvert at present, is in page 42. where he says, "You was an avowed enemy to ecclesiastical titles, and "publicly preached against them; but now you defend and "accept them under another form." This other form happens to be one, which is authorised in Scripture, to which I never was an enemy, and which I never preached against at one time, and defended and accepted at another. The reader will, therefore, consider whether Mr. Haldane, in this instance, proves my fickleness, or his own want of candour.

In his Letters, page 44, he says, "you find fault with the "public teaching, as turning on subjects of internal arrange-"ment; but in regard to things of this nature, who has "exceeded you? Do you recollect the manner in which you "preached on church order, for a long time after you went "to Glasgow?" I recollect it perfectly well. I preached four or five sermons on that subject, before the formation of our church, on Eph. iv. 1—6; and the manner in which I preached, was quite different from that which I find fault with, in 216—219 of my Statement.—"You have not "forgotten the fast days, in which you said so much against "the Church of Scotland, or the frequent sermons you "preached in Edinburgh, on that subject." In my fast day sermons, in which I might be thought to speak against the Church of Scotland, I generally confined myself to this one topic, that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, and

that if any trust in the solemnities of a fast, or other days of preparation, for an acceptable approach to the Lord's table, they are unacquainted with the only ground of acceptance with God. I believe that there are ministers in the Church of Scotland, who on the same occasion, would speak to the same purpose. At any rate, my manner of doing it was quite different from that, with which I have lately found fault. As to my "frequent sermons in Edinburgh on that subject," it so happens, that, except in one or two instances in which subjects were suggested to me by Mr. Haldane, it has been my custom to preach, when I went there, on whatever subjects I had immediately before been preaching on at home. In this way, when lecturing through the Gospels, I happened to go to Edinburgh, when I had arrived at the 23d chapter of Matthew, and in lecturing there from the 1st to the end of the 12th verse, I said, as I had before done at home, many things which were certainly against the practice of all National Churches. Nor have I made any change in my sentiments on these subjects. But I do fear, that, on this and similar occasions, Mr. Haldane has often been hearing for others, what would have admitted of a very edifying application to himself. He thinks that our attention was directed to the corruptions of the Church of Scotland, much more frequently and exclusively than it ever was by me. As a proof of what I now assert, a great part of the substance of what I delivered, in the above-mentioned lecture, (the most pointed discourse, I remember to have ever preached on ecclesiastical dignity, titles, and dress,) happened to have been previously printed by me in the Missionary Magazine. From the following extracts, my readers will see, whether the attention of the hearers was exclusively directed to the corruptions of the Church of Scotland. "He (our Saviour,) clearly "foresaw the abuses which would arise from the ambition "of bishops and presbyters, *and leading men of every denomination, however humble in name and in appearance, and where, perhaps, their very influence proceeded from their professed abhorrence "of dignitaries and human authority in the church.*"—"The propriety of our Saviour's insisting to strongly upon this subject "will be sufficiently seen from the little attention which, "after all, has been paid to his doctrine respecting it, and "the bad consequences that have thence followed. Had "human authority been steadily rejected, heresies could "never have arisen, and far less become inveterate in the "church of Christ. Persecution would have been the crime

" only of the infidel. ' The churches would have had rest,
" ' and been edified, and walking in the fear of the Lord,
" ' and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, been multiplied.'
" The reverse of all this has been too much the fact, and all
" professing Christians will agree to lament it; *yet such is*
" *our corruption and weakness, that personal influence, human*
" *authority, or the fear and admiration of man, insinuate them-*
" *selves every where, throughout the church; and* PERHAPS THESE
" THINGS NEVER PREVAIL MORE ANY WHERE, NOR IS AC-
" TUAL RESISTANCE OF THEM ANY WHERE MORE QUICKLY
" RESENTED, THAN WHERE IT IS HELD AS ONE OF THE
" FIRST PRINCIPLES, THAT THEY SHOULD IN ALL CASES BE
" EXPLODED." Missionary Magazine for June, 1797, pages 246, 247, 248.

I have only to add, on this letter, that I can cordially adopt the lamentation and prayer of the concluding paragraph, page 45; while I must say, that the constraint complained of appears to me to be wilful on the part of Mr. Haldane. He has had all along a fair opportunity of conversing with me, had he really wished it; and he might have importuned me for his house in private, with the same success as in a publication.

I now insert Mr. Haldane's letter to Mr. Harley, which was handed about by Mr. Jackson with the letters to me, and should have appeared along with them, in Mr. Haldane's pamphlet. See pages 144 and 145. If Mr. Haldane has still any friend, who spares neither trouble nor expence in promoting his plans, he may learn from this letter, the treatment to be expected, as soon as Mr. Haldane shall take a single step, which he cannot follow.

London, September 9th, 1808.

MY DEAR SIR,

I received your letter of the 17th ult. in consequence of which I have written to Mr. Ewing. It is unnecessary to repeat what I have said to him respecting the Tabernacle. The original transaction, when fully considered, sufficiently speaks for itself. If you hesitate for a moment, in regard to the impropriety of it, I ask if you would yourself repeat such an act. I can venture to say you would not *, But there are other circumstances now connected with it

* If Mr. Harley would not repeat such an act, it must be from a desire not to be again deceived.

which of themselves decide the matter, and render it impossible that any man could desire to take a legal advantage, or attempt to enforce possession in such a situation.

You observe in your letter, that many both in Edinburgh and Glasgow, feel much interested in Mr. Ewing's behalf. Is he then to be viewed as an object of compassion in this business *? Has he in equity any further claim upon me, or has he not yet received sufficient advantage in the free possession of the house for ten years? Did he give up any thing for it, or convey to me any value in exchange? Was he obliged to keep it a single day, if he had seen or chosen any thing which he would have preferred? Whatever was his feeling towards me formerly, is it his wish as matters now stand, to be always obliged to me for a gratuitous possession? I cannot suppose this to be the case. Nor can it, with propriety, be viewed as a hardship, if I state my expectation that he and his friends will now provide themselves. When he shows the incongruity of the churches in not taking upon themselves the support of their seminaries, I have a right to expect that, paying a due regard to consistency, he will extend this principle to all their other concerns, and, of course, restore possession of this house. Would a line of conduct opposite to this, discover that spirit of independence, of which he speaks; or would it not rather be a specious arrangement of giving and taking, endeavouring to make the churches appear to be supporting themselves, while, in reality, they were living upon another. Inconsistency apart, the aukwardness of the situation would be manifest to every one acquainted with the circumstances. "The rottenness of the whole "scheme" would soon be obvious. It is written, that it is more blessed to give than to receive, but we no where read of the blessedness of giving and receiving at the same time †.

But are you and Mr. Ewing's other friends so entirely destitute of what is necessary for the support of yourselves and your system, as to render it impossible, or do you only want the inclination? Here, my dear Sir, allow me to speak to you personally. In your letter to me, you write with much approbation of what took place at the beginning of our

* Mr. Harley's words did not call for so mean and insulting a question. No man, who knows the usage of the poor preachers from the late Society for propagating the Gospel at Home, would think of moving Mr. Haldane by the view of "an object of compassion."

† The reader will find answers to every part of this paragraph in the preceding pages.

acquaintance, through the application of my property. Since that time, your business has abundantly prospered. You have confessedly succeeded in your worldly concerns beyond many. You have been adding field to field, and have discovered new and unexpected sources of emolument. You have even enjoyed such a degree of superfluity, as to enable you to embellish your grounds with decorations that are useless although ornamental; but what great exertions have you made in the way of which you profess so much to approve? I do not press this inquiry farther, and, perhaps, you could answer it very satisfactorily; but allow me to remind you, that our first duty in the application of property, in religion as well as in every thing else, undoubtedly consists *in providing for ourselves*. Would it then have been too much to have expected that, before this time, you should have proposed to assist in taking the Tabernacle at Glasgow off my hands, not only to assist in enabling me to support the great expences you knew I was incurring in the same cause in other places, but also in order to bear your own part of the burden, especially as you had so long been receiving my aid? If, however, this was not done, could I for a moment suppose, that when circumstances are so far altered, and our connection is broken, you would hesitate to restore the house to me at once, with thankfulness for the past; or is it possible to conceive that you would applaud the resolution to retain it? Are you afraid, as you intimate, that if my talents were restored, I would pervert them? The consideration of this is not the principle on which you are called to act. We are not to do evil to prevent evil, more than in order that good may come. And duty to the Lord neither requires nor admits that you should take advantage of any mistake, or that you should offer as a sacrifice, the property of another, brought into your power by an unlawful alienation. The bond by which the house is held, being manifestly opposed in its nature and principles to the kingdom of Christ, is in a religious point of view, null and void, just as a civil bond would be, if contrary to the laws of the land, or as Mr. Ewing now deems a solemn subscription of the formulary of the Church of Scotland. Were any advantage then to be taken of it, in what light ought such conduct to be viewed? Or could any satisfaction be looked for in the unpleasant connection in which we should afterwards stand? Might not various evils be anticipated; and can you possibly suppose, that, by such a

state of things, the interests of the gospel could be promoted *?

You judge that what I have said to Mr. Ewing, is very impolitic in regard to the surplus. But my object in the business, as I have told him, is not pecuniary reimbursement. You will recollect, however, that although hitherto not demanded, the bond requires that the whole of the collections

* This paragraph is replete with the most injurious insinuation—Mr Harley and my other friends, have given such practical proofs of their inclination to support both themselves and their system, as Mr. Haldane, above all men, should be ashamed to deny.—What took place at the beginning of their acquaintance, was, by no means, "through the application of Mr. Haldane's property" alone. Without their contributions and personal exertions, the application of his property would never have become efficient.—"Adding "field to field," is an expression purposely containing an unfavourable allusion, that Mr. Harley's prosperity may be viewed with jealousy. Mr. Haldane ought to know, however, that transactions in land may be as lawful, as transactions in manufactures; and that, "adding thousand to thousand in the funds," although a business less open to human observation, may be equally, at least, a ground of jealousy.—"Embellishing grounds with decorations that "are useless," Mr. Haldane must know to be gross misrepresentation. Embellishing grounds, which are intended in any way to be disposed of, is as useful and as lawful, as embellishing manufactures for a market. Did Mr. Haldane find his embellishments had been useless when he sold Airthrey? Does he hold it unlawful to put a farm in order, before it be let? Such a way of speaking in another might have been ascribed to ignorance, but no such excuse can be made for him.—"What great exertions have you made in the way of which "you profess so much to approve?" is a question which I can answer for Mr. Harley; and my answer for him to Mr. Haldane, is, "much greater "exertions proportionally, than have ever been made, so far as I have known, "by the interrogator." Besides his gratuitous exertions for many years about the temporal affairs of the Tabernacle, and his contributions, both for its support, and for every laudable purpose which happened to be recommended to his notice; it is well known to many, and particularly to Mr. Haldane himself, that in the important object of the religious instruction of children, both by Sabbath and week-day schools, he has made very great exertions, indeed, and that at very considerable personal expence. But the above is a question, the very asking of which argues so improper a spirit, that Mr. Harley could not have given it a direct answer for himself, without a violation of christian modesty. The terms, in which it is couched, appear to me to be a humbling specimen of vanity, challenging an unwise comparison. The sentence may well admit of being thus completed; "*You know what great exertions I have made:* "what great exertions have you made?" Let Mr. Haldane read Dan. iv. 30, 31. and 2 Cor. x. 12.—"Would it then have been too much to have expected "that, before this time, you should have proposed to assist in taking the "Tabernacle at Glasgow, off my hands?" This sentence shows what "great "exertions" Mr. Haldane wishes for, from Mr. Harley, and corresponds with the opinion I have expressed above, page 30, that Mr. Haldane "seems ever "since (the opening of the Tabernacle) to have had a grudge at me, because "I would not solicit the church to purchase his property." But how opposite is it to the authorised declaration? "Unless you voluntarily choose to give "something towards defraying the expence of the house, you may [illegible] with "as little cost as if still in a parish church." See above, page 61.

at the Tabernacle shall be accounted for in the way it specifies, without any exception of what is made exclusively by the church. Even this surplus, like every thing else belonging to the bond, stands upon an improper footing. Indeed the whole of the way in which the money matters of the house were settled, is not only wrong in itself, but has given extensive currency to very unpleasant surmises. It has been reported, that instead of the Tabernacles at Glasgow, Dundee, and Edinburgh, being an expence to me, I derived from them a revenue of ten per cent. interest. The manner too, in which the house was conveyed to Mr. Ewing, has strengthened the opinion which has existed, and been propagated, that his leaving the Established Church, was not so much owing to his conscience being affected, as to his yielding to other motives and circumstances connected with his former situation *.

In making your proposal to me, about the purchase of the house, you think, that some will object to it, on the ground that you are sure of accommodation during Mr. Ewing's incumbency. Setting entirely out of view the nature of that footing on which it would in future be held, such as I suppose would be different from that on which any other house for worship is held in Britain, or from what any man or church would choose to hold one; where is your security for the continuance of this accommodation? You know it is possessed by you at Mr. Ewing's pleasure. Your situation may prove a snare, and you may be led to acquiesce where you ought to oppose, and to approve where you ought to condemn. For the very purpose of creating an authority over the church, the bond was conceived in the terms in which it runs; and for the very same purpose, the manner in which the choice of the assistant is regulated was afterwards fixed †. And is there no danger in your circumstances? In another situation, could you have allowed mutual exhortation in the church, which you had been taught, was an institution of Christ, to be set aside, without the most public, the most solemn and

* In this paragraph, more threats are thrown out about the collections for the poor.—A stress is laid on unpleasant surmises respecting himself, which he formerly professed to despise. And the opinion respecting the cause of my leaving the Established Church, which he has had the best opportunities of knowing to be false, and has often contradicted in the most solemn manner, he now seems willing to mention as "existing," being "propagated," and "strengthened;" without choosing to dispute its propriety.

† An answer will be found to these allegations, in pages 24, 65—68.

deliberate inquiry*? Could you have permitted your discipline to grow so remiss that the grand rule, Mat. xviii. 15. should be disregarded, and that your pastor should not be on speaking terms with one who bears office in the other church in Glasgow, with which you are closely united, and in which he occasionally presides in the worship †, and could you have allowed yourselves to be disunited from another church, in the manner in which this has lately taken place ‡. It is now a very common opinion, that the discipline and state of your church require reformation ‖. These things ought to be considered for your own sake as well as for Mr. Ewing's.

In fixing the sum I should require as the price of the house, you suppose that I will, no doubt, deduct the value of the lease. I have noticed this already in my letter to Mr. Ewing on the subject. I think you should have viewed the matter in another light. But on what ground do you speak of the bond as a *lease* or a *tack* as you elsewhere call it? Although these words may be used in the bond, this tenure is not entitled to such appellations. In forming your ideas on the subject, you should always recollect that nothing in the way of restipulation for possession of the house was given or conceded, on account of which it might deserve the name of a lease §.

You speak, in your letter, of the present indifference to the conversion of sinners. As you, no doubt, applied this

* See above, pages 126—130.

† Besides what is said above, pages 182, 183, it may now be added, that Mat. xviii. 15. was not disregarded in the misrepresented case, thus circulated in the hope of prejudising my brethren against me. Did Mr. Haldane reprove the informers who carried this tale to him, for never applying for an explanation of it to myself, if they really needed one? Did he not rather give them the greatest encouragement, by taking up an evil report against his neighbour, and becoming the publisher of their treacherous whisperings? It is surely a pity, that he should so often counteract the design of that plan of reformation, on which he is invariably proceeding.

‡ See above, pages 98—100.

‖ This opinion was never adopted by Mr. Haldane, till he saw that he should not be followed, in his new views, by the church in Jamaica-Street. "On this occasion, what conduct (according to his way of speaking) ought to "have been pursued? Should not his church have sent messengers to the spot, "calmly to investigate the matter, and affectionately to remonstrate if error "was discovered, giving their best advice, joined with their fervent prayers, "and waiting for a season, to observe the effect? But nothing of this kind was "done." See Mr. H.'s Letters, page 39.

§ See pages 26, 190, 191.

observation to the person to whom you wrote, I am entitled to answer for myself, and to say that it is not a fact. I have nothing to boast of, but I may be allowed to compare my present and my former sentiments and conduct; and when you compliment the one at the expence of the other, to tell you, that your judgement in the case is altogether unfounded. As, however, you have attempted no proof of what you assert, I need advance no refutation. I would only remind you of these words, "Judge not according to the appearance, "but judge righteous judgement."—You also lament that zeal is manifested for those things which, you say, gender strife, rather than godly edifying. What, then, are those things? Are they the inquiries that have been agitated concerning the commands and institutions of Christ? And have not the Scriptures been appealed to for what has been advanced? You cannot have forgotten the reverberation of this very cry when you left the Church of Scotland—the language of the pastoral admonition—and the constant accusations against us all for the course we, at that time, pursued. We thought a reformation was necessary. We were persuaded that the people of God were bound up by unscriptural laws, and that churches of Christ ought, exclusively, to consist of believers in his name. Yet you remember how much strife this last principle gendered, and how much the measures pursued were represented as at variance with peace and love, and every thing in which the essential principles of Christianity are concerned. Did we, therefore, desist in our inquiries, or stop short in our progress? And ought we now to be afraid of the inquiry, What saith the Scripture, and of the consequent effects, because this cry is again raised among ourselves? When we came out of the Church of Scotland, every thing was not attained or perfected. It was, therefore, duty to go forward in the same direction in which we were proceeding, and, disregarding the traditions whether originating among ourselves, or received from others, that appeared contrary to it, to regulate all things by the word of God. I believe that almost every thing which has of late been urged, in opposition to these inquiries, was formerly said on our leaving the Establishment. Faults, on both occasions, have, no doubt, been discerned, but I am fully convinced, that the general strain of opposition has, in both, proceeded on the same principle. In every attempt at reform, the truth of our Lord's declaration, that he came to bring fire on the earth, has been evinced. The constant unvarying opposition

of the world fully proves it; and it is a lamentable fact, that truth is opposed by the disciples themselves, with equal steadiness and almost with equal violence, in as far as it reaches beyond the limits of what they have already received. Yet none of the institutions or commandments of Jesus are calculated to produce strife, but all of them are adapted for Godly edifying. Indeed, the more they are received and obeyed, the more will their salutary effects be experienced. When at any time, however, they are proposed to our notice, it is true, that, with the world, we may find occasion for stumbling, and we may also discern in our brethren, as the world does in every Christian, what may justly be blamed; but we ought to be much on our guard, lest on account of such things, we should, at any time, reject the truth of God. I am sorry that you should repeat such assertions as you have made. Are you sure that you do no injustice when you so speak, and that you are not, in some instances, opposing what you have not properly inquired into, or do not fully understand? In preferring charges against others, proof should be given, and great caution exercised. I trust, however, you will shew a better specimen of your zeal than your letter affords. The spirit of Christianity will be more truly evinced, by cheerfully ministering of your own substance, than by attempting to force into the service, a contribution from your neighbour, whether you may allege that you do it in order to effect real good, or to hinder him from perverting it to positive evil *.

You observe that there now exists a strong prejudice against me and my measures, and, in this, I am fully persuaded you say the truth. Let me here remind you again of the prejudice

* Mr. Haldane is very desirous of representing the present controversy, as similar, if not the very same, with that which was occasioned, by our leaving the Church of Scotland. There is, however, this important difference between them. In the former case, one side acknowledged a certain authority belonging to human standards, while the other acknowledged, in religious matters, the authority only of the Holy Scriptures. In the latter case, both sides are agreed as to the only authority which they acknowledge; but the one of them chooses to refuse credit to the professions of the other on this subject, and to represent them as merely adhering to traditions, when they are merely contending for the doctrine of Scripture, as they understand it. After all the clamour of Mr. Haldane and his present friends, about our adherence to traditions, they have not been able to produce a single instance, in all that we have said, of an opinion resting on human authority. His own words, then, may well be applied to himself. "Are you sure that you do no injustice when "you so speak, and that you are not, in some instances, opposing what you "have not properly inquired into, or do not fully understand?"

that existed against both when I left the Church of Scotland. I believe the latter made no impression on you, and, I trust, I shall not be moved by the former. The prejudice, however, you will say, now exists among a different set of people, and these are good people, whose partiality and esteem I formerly enjoyed. But were there no good people among the others, and had I no share in their favour, when first I professed to obey the truth? The Apostles met with opposition, not only from the world, but also from the churches they had gathered. We are fools, says Paul to the Corinthian believers, but ye are wise. With prejudices from different quarters, I lay my account, while I certainly ought to be careful that they be not well founded. I am firmly persuaded, however, that if enabled to follow Paul, as he followed Christ, instead of this prejudice being diminished, it will be proportionably increased. I have long been convinced, that if I wished to acquire or to secure popularity and influence, it would have been necessary to have followed a different course from that which I have held. As it respects you, my dear Sir, I intreat you to be careful by what criterion you judge. Be careful, on the present occasion, to do what is right yourself. In regard to the bond, which has been the cause of our correspondence, the evil of its being given or accepted, was very early discovered by some of our friends. I offered such a one to another, who did not hesitate for a moment, to reject it. He declined having any thing bound about such a business. Time has thrown much light on the unscriptural nature of this contract, and whatever may be supposed, I believe it will soon have very few advocates, and that it will be even matter of astonishment, that ever it should have been thought of at the beginning of a professed reformation of religion. Let Mr. Ewing continue to act upon it, and I shall wish to know the principles on which he left Lady Glenorchy's chapel. If he can prove that the one is in Babylon, and that it was his duty to leave it, I am certain he will never be able to defend the other *.

* It has been shown, in the preceding pages, that I entered into my present situation, entirely in consequence of being kept completely in the dark as to the nature of it, till I could not well draw back; and till my friends as well as myself, thought I must continue in it, even at the expence of the most painful sacrifices. Whether Mr. Haldane contrived my situation at first, so as to provide himself with a handle against me, whenever he should have a mind to use it, I will not say; but, from the anecdote in this paragraph, and from many other parts of his Letters, (such as the explanation about the Liverpool

It is exceedingly unpleasant to be compelled to write to you as I have done. You may rest assured that I am actuated by no spirit of dislike to you or Mr. Ewing, or to the church with which you are connected. As you appear to me to be in many respects opposing the truth, I wish to be entirely freed from the connection in which we must stand, as long as you retain the house you occupy, on its present footing, during which time, as a church, you would be deriving from me the principal support of yourselves and your system. I mentioned to Mr. Ewing, that I supposed it would appear most adviseable for you to build a new house; but if you prefer purchasing the Tabernacle, I have no objections, as I intimated to him, to treat with you concerning it, as soon as our present connection in it is at an end.—At the close of your letter, you express your sincere regard for me, which I assure you, I do not in the smallest degree doubt. Be assured I feel the same for you. I am extremely sorry that any difference of opinion should subsist between us. I beg you will remember me very kindly to Mrs. Harley, and that you will believe me to be,

My Dear Sir,

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Robert Haldane.

Copy of another Letter from Mr. Haldane to Mr. Harley.

Edinburgh, September 22d, 1808.

My Dear Sir,

Since writing to Mr. Ewing and to you, in answer to your letter of the 17th ult. it has occurred to me, that lest I should appear to be standing on any punctilio in the business between us, which is far from being my design, I should have mentioned, as you desired, the price for which I am willing to sell the house. And if you resolve to purchase it, further discussion respecting the bond, will thus be prevented, which is certainly very desireable.

Magazine, his legal remarks on the contract, and his watching casual expressions in my unsuspecting conversation, for many years;) I am fully persuaded, that he has long had the train laid, and that his conscience, which is now pleaded as the sole cause of the explosion, very prudently exercised *forbearance*, till circumstances might help to excuse the application of the match.

I would, therefore, now say, that I am ready to sell the house, for what it has cost me, allowing the price, if you choose, to be paid by instalments, in a reasonable way, as might afterwards be settled. Excepting the money originally paid for the Circus, the whole, I believe, has gone through your hands, so that you know there has been no unnecessary expenditure. It is impossible, I should think, that any one could propose or even desire other terms. The whole was laid out purposely for the object to which it has been applied, and you have been hitherto reaping the benefit of it.

The Tabernacle at Glasgow is now the only house that is held in the manner described in the bond, a mode of tenure, which as henceforth it can neither be honourable nor comfortable to any of the parties concerned, will I hope soon be superseded in a way agreeable to us all. I am,

My Dear Sir,

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Robert Haldane.

From this letter, the reader will perceive, that after all the qualms of Mr. Haldane's conscience; all the wickedness of the bond, and the evils to which it is said to have given rise; all the alleged powerful operation of the Tabernacle in a direction contrary to the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom;—a sufficient atonement may be found in MONEY. Having seen his threatening and strong language fruitless, he now attempts to cajole; but the conclusion is the same, "Give me the "house, or give me the money." He is willing to sell the house to be used for the very purposes, for which it is used at present; nay, he is willing to sell at prime cost, and to accommodate us, in the manner of payment, on terms to be afterwards settled. His object, then, is not to remove the house from the use I am making of it; the scruple in his mind does not appear to be, that I am employing this property to disseminate error; but that I am employing it without profit to him.

The most disgraceful thing, however, in this letter is, that Mr. Haldane, if we will only give him his money, is willing to take it as HUSH-MONEY. "If you resolve to purchase it, "further discussion respecting the bond will thus be prevented, "which is certainly very desireable." When I read this sentence, I remembered Paul's reply to the message of the magistrates of Philippi, Acts xvi. 37. "They have beaten us openly

" uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; " and now do they thrust us out privily? nay verily." For nearly four months, had Mr. Haldane been clamouring about this bond, by word, by letter, by himself, and by various associates, who retailed his arguments, and circulated his reports: he had left no means untried, that could sow dissension in the church, or disunite it from other churches with which it is connected: he had spread complaints against me, from the one end of the kingdom to the other, on account of a transaction, of which he was himself the author, and, from first to last, the sole director: he had teased me with letter upon letter, every fortnight, as if, like Caligula, he wished " so to strike, that I might feel myself die *:"—and now, if my friends and I would only accede to his old demand immediately after my coming to Glasgow †; if we would give him his money, that he might not lose the cost of a scheme which he now disliked; all the formidable things with which he had tried to frighten us, should be heard of no more. This, says Mr. Haldane, " is certainly very desireable." Very desireable perhaps to him, who must be conscious of his injustice, and cannot but be mortified, (whatever he may affect to feel,) at the odium which attends it. But very far indeed, from being desireable to me, after being so cruelly calumniated and misrepresented. To have purchased on this footing, would have been to have confessed guilt. No! I am reproached, but I am not detected in a crime. Let discussion respecting the bond, proceed as it may, till the author of both it and the discussion on it, shall think proper to desist.

Another part of this letter which deserves animadversion, is the boast, that " the Tabernacle at Glasgow is " now the only house that is held in the manner described " in the bond." He should have added, and the only house, from which such a church, as was originally gathered in it, has not yet been driven. The expulsion of the churches is, not only an injury to them, but, as has been shown above, page 9, " a breach of engagement to me, as one of the par- " ties concerned" in the scheme, as it was at first proposed;

* " Non temere in quemquam, nisi crebris et minutis ictibus, animadverti " passus est: perpetuo notoque jam præcepto, *Ita feri, ut se mori sentiat.* SUET. " He allowed scarcely any one to be executed, except by often repeated and " slight blows; for it was his constant, and now well known order, *Strike so, " that he may feel himself die.*"

† See his Letters, page 75, and above, page 30.

and I feel this breach of engagement to me, as to the houses in Edinburgh and Dundee, no less than as to the house in Glasgow.

Having these views of this letter, I requested Mr. Harley to decline all further overtures, about purchasing the Tabernacle, as I could consent to no bargain, which did not acknowledge the validity and justice of my right to occupy that house.

I come now to the note of October 10th, 1808, which Mr. Haldane sent me when I had gone to Edinburgh, and which he has inserted in his pamphlet, at page 46. Every one who compares this note, with those which passed between Mr. Haldane and me, when I was last at Edinburgh before, and which are inserted above, page 104—107; or with the conversation between us at the door of my house in Glasgow, of which an account is given above, page 121; will see, that Mr. Haldane, when he wrote it, must have been perfectly sensible, that it was contrary to my views of duty to agree to his professedly intended interview. In this case, and when no change of circumstances had taken place, to warrant the smallest expectation, that I could change my determination, I conceive his only object, in writing that note, must have been, to get another story to circulate against me. He was himself so sensible, that this must be the natural inference concerning it, that he pretended to Mr. Innes, (with whom it seems he had communication on the subject,) that he had proposed the meeting with me alone this time, on a new ground, which had not before occurred to him, but which now appeared to him, to make it his duty to tell me my fault between him and me alone. This alleged new ground was, that when he had called on me at Glasgow, (as mentioned above page 121,) I had used him with marked incivility in the drawing-room, before we had gone down to the door, and, of course, before he had made his demand of the Tabernacle. Fortunately, there were witnesses present with us in the drawing-room, on that occasion, by whose evidence the charge could have been refuted. But it was in itself obviously incredible, for I could be under no temptation to act in any such way, before the demand was made, of which I had not the most distant expectation. At any rate, if it really had been his object to meet with me alone, on a new ground, he ought to have fairly announced this circumstance in his note. In that case, however, he would have acted, as in the conversation at the door of my house in Glasgow, (see above

page 121,) in which, although he alleged it was about other things, than those on which I had formerly declined speaking to him alone, that he wanted to converse, he has since been contradicted by his own pen, (see his Letters, page 8, and above, page 122.) Nor would he have had the apology of imagining that I might admit the force of such a consideration; for in that conversation, I had expressly declared, that "the subject could make no difference; that I had told him, "before whom only he and I could converse." I have, above, used the word "pretended" in regard to this story, both on account of what I have just stated in its refutation, and on account of Mr. Haldane's letter of November 7th, 1808, (also inserted in his pamphlet, at page 46,) from which it is manifest, that though he "pretended" to Mr. Innes that he had proposed the meeting with me alone this time, on a new ground; it was his intention, had he obtained such a meeting, to have attacked me on the old ground. He seems now, indeed, to be ashamed of this pretence, and has therefore suppressed it in his publication. It is, however, essentially necessary to the illustration of his conduct, in sending to me at Edinburgh his note of October 10th, 1808.

In his letter of November 7th, 1808, Mr. Haldane introduces a commentary on Mat. xviii. 15—17. to show that, because I will not permit him to converse with me alone, therefore he is at liberty to proceed no further. "This is "the first step, says he, and I must not overleap, or super-"sede it, to proceed to the second."—"Henceforth the "whole remains with you."—"I intreat you to consider "what you are doing. You are resisting the authority of an "explicit commandment of Jesus Christ." The commandment is very explicit, and very beautiful and salutary; but it is sadly wrested by many who profess to revere it. I have shown above, page 105, that this commandment did not at all apply to the case between Mr. Haldane and me, because the offences alleged were entirely of a public nature, and because he had previously rendered necessary a separation from church-fellowship. I am, therefore, nowise answerable for any embarrassment into which he may have brought himself, by insisting on an application of it, which does not appear to have been intended by our Saviour. But supposing, for argument's sake, that it did apply to the case between us; is it not to be obeyed by Mr. Haldane, as professedly the person offended? Shall my resistance confine his obligation to obey, to the first step? A man may not hear his brother, although

he should allow him to speak with him alone; but surely the man who does not allow him so much as thus to speak, may well be included also, among those who will not hear. On failing as to the first step, Mr. Haldane cannot say, that it was impossible for him to have taken the second. He ought at least, therefore, to have made the attempt; although, from the nature of the case, I should have felt myself at perfect liberty to have given, or to have refused, my consent, as I thought proper. It was the third step only that could not have been taken, from the separation which Mr. Haldane had previously effected; and that circumstance might have shown him the unreasonableness of referring to this commandment at all.

If Mr. Haldane had really felt himself tied up by Mat. xviii. 15. from doing more than attempting to converse with me alone; how came he to write me so many letters? how came he, in the very next letter he wrote, viz. that of November 15th, 1808, inserted in his pamphlet at page 50, to ask a sight of answers, which, he understood, I had written to his former letters to Mr. Harley and me? how came he to cause his letters to be handed about at Glasgow? above all, how came he to publish them, with some retrenchments, and with a preface, introduction, and conclusion, in his late pamphlet? Was there no "overleaping" or "superseding" of the first step here?—He tries to evade the force of this question, in his introduction, page 7, by pleading his "many "unsuccessful attempts" to get every thing amicably settled. Those "many attempts" are only in fact a single one; made at first in such a way as to show that he did not really wish it to succeed, see above, page 104, and repeated afterwards, see pages 105, 107, with a perseverance encouraged by his knowledge of my determination never to comply with it. He also pleads, what the preceding documents have shown to be false, (see above, page 96,) "the complete separation, "which, he says, I HAVE made between the churches." He ought to have said, which HIMSELF HAD made between the churches.—He pleads, further, that his is not "the first "publication" between him and me. In this, he is correct. But why, then, did he not honestly name the first one? Why did he not confess the part he had taken in the publication of the "Treatise on the Elders' Office?" No man, who has perused the preceding documents, can wonder at the personality of a faithful answer to such a book, published and

circulated in such a manner*. At any rate, if necessity were a plea for "overleaping or superseding the first step," in order to proceed to steps not known in the rule at all; how much more would it have justified "overleaping or super-"seding the first, in order to proceed to the second!" This extraordinary theory, on Mat. xviii. 15—17. appears to me to be the strongest possible confirmation of the opinion which I have already expressed, page 104, that Mr. Haldane never wanted a private conversation with me, but rather to have it to say, that he had sought one. When he was not sure but I might have agreed to it, he delayed the proposal, till the second last day of my being in town; it was not till he had it under my hand, that I thought it my duty to refuse, unless before witnesses, that he became importunate to obtain it. To me, it has been all along evident, from the tenor of his letters, which may deceive strangers, but never can convince me, that he was determined on a publication from the very first; (and after publishing the Treatise on the Elders' Office, he might as well have published directly;) but he has preferred the indirect plan of seeming to desire a secret conversation; which, had it been granted, would probably have formed a large addition to his publication, and, being declined, furnishes at least an additional subject of complaint against me.

In this same letter, page 48, Mr. Haldane tells me, that, although in our conversations, both may have been to blame, "he really thinks that I have exceeded, and been deficient in "that meekness with which God is well pleased." I readily admit, that I have often expressed in conversation with Mr. Haldane, the strongest disapprobation of his conduct; and the reader will see, from the preceding pages, that I had reason to do so; but it does not appear to me, that we have not often been equally warm; and if I have been deficient in meekness, the temptation has generally been, that he seemed to me to have been previously deficient in plain-dealing. Neither he nor I, however, should be confident, when acting as judges in our own cause. We had better unite in saying, "Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me, and know "my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me, "and lead me in the way everlasting."

* For a vindication of my mode of reproof and correction, see above, pages 192—194.

The principal thing which I have to do in adverting to the letter of November 15th, 1808, page 50, is to supply the chasm, which contains matter essential to the illustration of Mr. Haldane's conduct towards me, in urging the unjust demand of the Tabernacle. It is as follows,—" I have since then been considering the precarious state of the walls, which I mentioned to you last year in Glasgow. This is, undoubtedly, a strong additional reason for rather building a new house, as I formerly advised, than purchasing the present one. Indeed, the propriety of continuing long to collect large numbers of people into that house is very questionable, and I believe this has already given you some uneasiness. Were it, however, after all, to appear an object to purchase it, there seems to be one method only that can be adopted, both to guard against danger and to remove responsibility. The length of an ordinary house might be taken off from the west end, at least as far as the pulpit, without perhaps diminishing the congregation, and a new gable built. This would, I believe, cut off that part of the wall which split and pushed out, and also the rent on the opposite side, by which, at present, the west gable is in a manner separated from the rest of the building. Were a new gable put up, these walls might be rebuilt of a proper thickness, at no great expence, I should suppose, while the shortening of the house would add greater security to the remaining walls, which were originally too slight for so long a building and so heavy a roof. The person I caused to inspect them, between two and three years ago, when Mr. Harley, who was much alarmed, wrote to me that the failure had taken place, reported, that he thought they would stand, but desired they might be carefully watched. However, in the prospect of continuance, by purchasing the house for a place of worship, it does not seem proper to run the smallest risk. In such a case, no doubt should be left of what might be the effect of the foundation being softened by water, of a weight of snow on the roof, of a heavy wind, or a sudden alarm or shake of a crowded congregation. The front stair, it must also be remembered, which, at present, may serve as a prop, I am under obligation, if desired, to remove. Some such plan for security as that above mentioned, if, indeed, it would be effectual, ought therefore to be resorted to, and perhaps the yearly income of the part taken off, may do more than pay for the alteration. Be this as it may, were it thought adviseable, I would settle, in an equitable manner, about any

thing of this kind, as I have no desire to receive more for the property than a fair value between the church and me. The price I named to Mr. Harley was the prime cost, which, on all hands, I suppose, would be deemed reasonable, unless any deduction, on account of something like the above, were deemed necessary. Since I purchased and fitted it up, there is a great increase of price on labour and materials. But I have lately been informed, that the church and you intend, &c."

Had all that Mr. Haldane wrote before, in these letters, appeared to me to be as good, as it has appeared to be the contrary, I think this passage must nevertheless have opened my eyes. I suppose it is needless to stop to prove, that Mr. Haldane professed to have put me in possession of a house that was of sufficient strength for the purpose to which it was destined; or that he bound himself, if the funds fell short, to be at the expence of all necessary repairs *. But I have to state, that when an alarm took place at the opening of the house, it had an effect on my mind, which Mr. Haldane knows, I have never been able completely to remove. For many a day, he took all possible pains to allay my apprehension. I have known him stand at the very gable, of which he speaks in the above passage, and desire me to observe how exactly it continued on the perpendicular. Often did he remark to me, that such a wall, twenty years old, was far more secure, than a new wall. Often did he tell me what an excellent roof the house had, and how well supported the gallery was, by pillars behind as well as before, so that, although the walls were entirely taken away, still it must stand firm. Even when Mr. Harley had taken the alarm, to which he refers, Mr. Haldane cordially united with him, in the propriety of concealing the circumstance from me, that I might not be distracted in the discharge of my public duty. But now he is determined to stick at nothing, which will lead, or drive me out of that house. If I will retain possession of it, I am to be frightened to the utmost, and the congregation may perish in the ruins, for he acknowledges no obligation to keep it in repair. But if we will purchase, no one can be more ready than he to offer advice. It is really amusing to see how confidently he states his plan for our procedure with the tottering old house, as if, after all the treatment we have received from him, he were still entitled to consider himself

* See above, page 23.

as a man of our counsel. All the faults he ascribes to it now, were known to him, when he so frankly offered it to Mr. Harley in his letter of September 22d, 1808, inserted at page 209, for the whole sum which it originally cost him. He is not sure, indeed, whether he ought not still to abide by the same demand.

The same day, on which I got this letter from Mr. Haldane, I wrote the following one to Mr. Harley.

Carlton-Place, 16th November, 1808.

My Dear Sir,

I have, this day, received a letter from Mr. Robert Haldane, in which he tells me, that the walls of the Tabernacle are in a precarious state; that the propriety of continuing long to collect large numbers of people into that house, is very questionable; that, between two and three years ago, a part of the wall had split and pushed out; that there is a rent on the opposite side, by which, at present, the west gable is in a manner separated from the rest of the building; that the walls were originally too slight for so long a building and so heavy a roof; that, between two and three years ago, you was much alarmed, and wrote to him that the above mentioned failure had taken place; that he had, in consequence, employed a person to inspect the walls, who reported that he thought the walls would stand, but desired they might be carefully watched.

Mr. H. says, he mentioned the precarious state of the walls to me last year, but he did not then mention any of the above alarming particulars; and, by his own statement, it appears, that the whole was kept a profound secret from me for at least a year after the alleged circumstances are said to have happened.

Since they are now brought forward, for the first time, in so very formidable a manner, I think it my duty to inquire into the real truth of the case. I, therefore, request to know from you, in writing, what the facts were, and when they happened; and also beg the name of the inspector, and a copy of his report, with an account of the means which have since been used for watching the walls, and what is the present opinion of those who are performing this duty. I am,

My Dear Sir,

Yours truly,

Greville Ewing.

Copy of the Answer.

Glasgow, 12th December, 1808.

My Dear Sir,

I duly received your letter of the 16th ult. wherein you state, that Mr. R. Haldane had wrote you about the precarious state of the Tabernacle, and mentioned a number of alarming particulars. Agreeable to your request, I shall relate all I recollect of the business. About three years ago, I observed some rents in the plaster of the Tabernacle, and also on the outside walls; in consequence of which I wrote Mr. R. Haldane—but I do not now remember what I said to him.

Soon after the receipt of my letter, he sent west Mr. Black, who, with Mr. Robert Watt, carefully examined the House both within and without, and they thought there was no danger, especially if the rents were of an *old date.*

They recommended to have them filled up, which was immediately done, and stated the propriety of watching to see if they opened again.

I have frequently looked at the several places that were mended, and to this time there is not the least appearance of any alteration.

There is, therefore, every reason to conclude that the rents had taken place immediately after the fitting up of the Tabernacle, although they were not discovered until the time stated above. I do not think the inspectors made out a written report. I may add, that, at my suggestion, they ordered the water that fell from the roof to be carried in a drain some distance from the walls of the house, which was done. As I was satisfied there was no danger, I thought it improper to mention any thing of the business to you, as it might give you unnecessary uneasiness. Indeed, I did not mention it to any. I am,

My Dear Sir,

Yours truly,

(Signed) W. Harley.

After finding that the private circulation of Mr. Haldane's letters, (in which the above passage, though suppressed in his pamphlet, was contained at full length,) had occasioned much talking, and was likely to excite alarm; I thought it improper to confine myself to the private opinion of any

tradesman, employed by any of the parties immediately concerned. I, therefore, gave in a petition to the Dean of Guild Court, requesting them to order the building to be inspected.

The report of the Gentlemen, who made the inspection, stated, that the walls, roof, and galleries were in a state of good and sufficient repair, and that not the least danger to the congregation was to be apprehended: that there was, however, an angle beam in the south west corner of the gallery, which, owing to the carelessness of the tradesmen, had not a sufficient bearing in the wall, and under the end of which they recommended a pillar to be placed: that there were also a few stone rybyts in one of the south side walls, that would require repairing.

The repairs recommended in this report were immediately ordered. While they were going on, a member of the church, who happened to be one of the workmen employed, called on me, and, in my presence, addressed to me the following letter.

Glasgow, 3d March, 1809.

DEAR SIR,

As I was working these two days past in the Tabernacle, for Messrs. Waddel and Park, in opening up the pavement in the passage, which had been out of the level, I, to my great astonishment, observed several of the wooden props that support the galleries, not founded at all with stone or any hard substance, but only on a joist of wood which is now nearly rotten for want of air. I am not in the smallest interested in the business, but I think it my duty to let you know of it, and likewise for the benefit of society, as it is not safe for a multitude of people to assemble there, unless these pillars be founded properly with stone. I am,

DEAR SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) MUNGO NASMITH, Mason.

On reading this letter, I thought I had arrived at last at something, to which Mr. Haldane might justly apply the favourite phrase, with which he says, I furnished him; "*the "rottenness of the whole scheme.*" It remains with him to account to the public, for the manner in which he fitted up that house for their reception; for the alarm and injury which many suffered at the opening of it; and, for the risk, which,

it would appear, hundreds have occasionally run of losing their lives, when the place happened to be much crowded, these ten years past.—At first I thought of shutting up the galleries altogether, and had, indeed, given orders to that effect. But after examining the discovery which had been made, the gentlemen who were executing the repairs, advised me only to discontinue for a few weeks, the evening sermon, when the congregation is often numerous, and of a less steady description, and to apply again to the Dean of Guild Court, for a more thorough inspection of the house, and for authority to execute what might be necessary for the safety of the people. A second inspection was applied for, and granted accordingly; in consequence of which, four or five of the pillars were discovered to have had no proper foundation. They have now been, by order of the Court, made secure, and the evening sermons, which were omitted for a week or two, have been resumed.

In Mr. Haldane's letter, I must also notice the following sentences, in page 53. "I wish too solemnly to warn others who "may be afterwards placed in circumstances similar to those in "which I stood, never to deviate so far from the line of duty, "under the idea of doing a service acceptable to God, as to "place their talents, by a legal instrument, at the disposal of "another person, however highly they may esteem him. "This is a very different thing from laying down property "at the feet of an Apostle. I am strongly persuaded, that "you would not now do the same thing, or advise it in the "case of another. Am I mistaken in this? Or would it not, "both in the gift and acceptance, be altogether wrong?" These sentences are complete evidence, that when Mr. Haldane, in his introduction, page 7, ascribes the publication of his Letters to my refusing to meet with him alone, he has not fairly declared the truth. His Letters were written from the very first, with a view to publication. It was in this way only, that he could give to others the solemn warning of which he here speaks. The whole, then, of his importunity to see me alone, after he knew I would not consent; and the whole of his outcry since; are mere stratagems for bringing me under increased reproach. After all, there must have been a pamphlet on the subject; and the use which he would have made of any conversation between ourselves alone, may be judged of, from that which he has made of the detached expressions, which he has culled out of my conversations with him many years ago, which I do not at all

remember to have used, and, of course, cannot decide either on their identity, or their original application. As to "the "solemn warning" which he says he wishes to give, I can have no objection to it. I think my case will be as "solemn "a warning" as that of Mr. Haldane. He remarks, that what he did was "a very different thing from laying down property "at the feet of an Apostle." Certainly it was: did Mr. Haldane ever profess to think it the same thing? If he did; it was never in my hearing, nor in consequence of any encouragement from me. The primitive converts at Jerusalem who had property, acted in a manner which, though called for only by an extraordinary occasion, is certainly recorded as a general example, as far as circumstances may require. In this view, I have quoted, as many have, Acts ii. 44, 45. and iv. 34—37. when exhorting the rich to liberality in the cause of Missions *. But instead of claiming the character of an Apostle, I have always objected to such a claim; and when Mr. Haldane asked me to agree to make use of a house for purposes prescribed by himself, I little imagined that he would afterwards pretend that he had laid any thing "at my "feet." He is "strongly persuaded, he says, that I would "not now do the same thing, or advise it in the case of ano-"ther." I certainly would not now do the same thing *with Mr. Haldane;* but my refusal would by no means proceed on any conviction, that it was in itself wrong. It would be entirely owing to the view which his conduct obliges me to take of his character.

I come now to the concluding paragraph of Mr. Haldane's last letter, [see Letters, page 53.] "I have informed Mr. Harley and you, that pecuniary reimbursement is not my object; and that I only wish to recover the application of my talents from being subservient to a system, which I conceive to be exerting itself in opposition to reformation, and the advancement of the gospel, and to restore them to a lawful direction. If you now purchase the house, or give it up, it is my intention to apply, without delay, what I receive from the property, in translating and multiplying copies of the Scriptures. This, you will observe, is paying away the value of the whole, which would, in course, at length revert to my estate. Of the importance of this object, especially in the present situation of the world, and with the facilities now afforded for circulating the word of God, there can be only one opinion."—This paragraph, which forms the con-

* See my defence of Missions, pages 86—88.

clusion of the whole series of Letters, I consider as a last shift to gild over the odiousness of an unjustifiable demand. It has already been seen, that money, and money alone, would have satisfied Mr. Haldane, and purchased his silence, whatever guilt he professed to have beheld in our situation, and whatever impenitence we might, in other respects, have continued to manifest: see above, page 210. Whether his object be "reimbursement" or not, I pretend not to judge. To a man of his fortune, the whole amount is a mere trifle, and I have no doubt, he would now be willing to cast it into the sea, rather than let it remain with him, to whom he voluntarily bound himself to commit the use of it.—As to his "only wishing to recover the application of his talents from "being subservient to a bad system," the reader has seen above, in page 30, that he was as anxious to recover the application of his talents, from the system, when he professed to think it good, as now when he professes to think it bad.—If he had really a right to sell the house, it would be quite unnecessary to give previous intimation, what he intended to do with the money. Many are equally liberal in contributing for the translation and multiplication of copies of the Scriptures, without sounding a trumpet before them in a printed letter. If he *can* receive the money as his own, let him do what he will with his own: If he *can not*, let him consider the solemn declaration, "I the Lord love judgement, I hate "robbery, for burnt-offering," Isaiah lxi. 8.—From this part of his letter, a report has gone abroad, that Mr. Haldane would give the price of the Tabernacle, were it sold, to the Bible Society. Those, who believe this report, know not the gentleman, whose words they so loosely interpret. Unless it should be to disprove my opinion, I certainly do think, that Mr. Haldane has no intention of giving the price of the Tabernacle to the Bible Society He will apply it, he says, without delay, "in translating and multiplying copies of "the Scriptures." Translations of the Scriptures by Mr. Haldane, or by others having *a "controlled" and "qualified" use of his talents*, is a scheme of the importance of which, I believe there can be somewhat more than "only one opinion *." But whatever be his intention, as here expressed, it must be remembered, that it is only his intention of November 15th, 1808, the date of the letter.

* Let my readers consider the views given in Mr. Haldane's Letters of Matth. xviii. [illegible], pages 46—49: of 1 Tim. v. 8, 16, page 25: and of James iii. 1, page 72.

When a purchase should be made, this intention might come to be classed with his intention of July 8th, 1799, the date of what he used to call "the tack of the Tabernacle: see above, pages 21 and 66. To suppose any thing else, would be to "violate the fundamental principle, that, *in a reli-* "*gious connection or co-operation, every thing ought to be free* "*from first to last* *. With this fundamental principle, applied as it is by him, even to contracts about property, Mr. Haldane ought really to be very particular in guarding people, against placing any confidence in his declared intentions; for, however clearly he may see that it will be his duty to depart from those declarations as often as he shall happen to change his mind, and however invariably he may proceed on this plan of reformation, he must be sensible that, from remaining ignorance and prejudice, many are but too prone to give undue credit to any thing which they foolishly mistake for a faithful promise.

I shall now insert the last correspondence between Mr. Haldane and Mr. Harley.

Edinburgh, February 4th, 1809.

My Dear Sir,

In looking through my accounts to-day, I cannot find the last settlement of the Tabernacle up to Whitsunday, 1808. If I recollect, I left it with you; as it was not signed by Mr. Ewing. May I request that you will be good enough to send it me by return of post, so that I may get it on *Tuesday morning*. Although it should not be signed, it is of no consequence, if you will send me, in the mean time, a copy of the particulars. If hurried, you can send it in a blank cover. I am,

My Dear Sir,

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) Robert Haldane.

Glasgow, February 6th, 1809.

Dear Sir,

I have yours of the 4th, and was surprised to find you had not the last account. After it was signed, I gave it to my young man to give you, as you promised to call for it. After some search, he found it in his desk—I herewith enclose it.

* See Mr. H.'s Letters, page 22.

From the use you made of my last letter *, you could not expect any thing but a blank cover with the account. I do not feel disposed to retaliate, but rather pity the man who could act so meanly. I consider it in vain either to dictate or find fault with you. You stand or fall to your own master: you are possessed of very superior talents, and, on that account, are, perhaps, in greater danger. I wish you may be kept in the right way, and at last be received into that happy society, where love and peace shall *reign* in every heart, and unless we possess these now, all other things will be as the sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. That you may enjoy true felicity, is the sincere desire of,

SIR,

Yours truly,

(Signed) W. HARLEY.

Edinburgh, February 10th 1809.

MY DEAR SIR,

I HAVE received the account, for which I thank you.

When you write as you do, you surely forget the style of your former letter. You may speak of propriety of conduct, and of love and peace; but while you are desirous of retaining the Tabernacle on its present footing, and of shifting upon me the expence of providing for your religious worship, in present circumstances, and after you have withdrawn from all religious connection—your conduct, to say no more, is very different from those principles which you profess to hold and admire. The free accommodation, were there nothing else in the case, which you have enjoyed at my expence, for these last ten years, might, and I hope will soon, lead you to judge in another manner. I am,

MY DEAR SIR,

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) ROBERT HALDANE.

P. S.—If you continue to act as you are doing, it is a small matter to me, "but he that doeth wrong shall receive for the "wrong which he hath done."

* Alluding to the handing about of the letters by Mr. Jackson.

That the whole affairs of the Tabernacle may be explained, I insert the accounts.

William Harley in Accompt with the Tabernacle, Glasgow, since opening, till 15th May, 1801.

William Harley, Dr.

1799.								
July	28.	House opened						
		To Collection,	-	*L.*	12	0	6½	
August		To ditto,	- - -		10	9	4½	
Sept.		To ditto,	- - -		62	12	7¾	
Oct.		To ditto,	- - -		34	3	9¾	
Nov.		To ditto,	- - -		33	12	1¾	
Dec.		To ditto,	- - -		40	12	1¾	
1800.								
January		To ditto,	- - -		24	16	9½	
February		To ditto,	- - -		25	10	11½	
March		To ditto,	- - -		27	18	4½	
April		To ditto,	- - -		18	19	1	
May	15.	To ditto,	- - -		10	7	11½	
								301 3 10

*L.*301 3 10

Tabernacle Glasgow, Cr.

1799.								
July	27.	By paper book, - - - - - - - -				0	1	0
Dec.	7.	By G. Ewing Sundries	100	0	0			
1800.								
January	16.	By W. Mair Door-keeper,	3	0	0			
May	15.	By William Hodge,	15	0	0			
		By feu duty, - - -	28	4	4			
		By G. Ewing Sundries,	100	0	0			
	27.	By Precentor full to 15th May 1800,	6	0	0			
		By lighting the lamps	0	8	0			
		By insurance for Mr. H.	9	2	3			
						261	14	7
February	5.	By coals, - - - - -	1	2	0			
May	16.	By ditto, - - - - -	0	11	0			
Oct.	15.	By ditto, - - - - -	0	11	6			
Dec.	31.	By ditto, - - - - -	0	11	6			
						2	16	0
April		By D. Matheson candles,	7	14	0			
1801.								
February	28.	By D. Paterson do.	13	0	0			
		By freight &c. of do.	0	4	6			
						20	18	6
						285	10	1
		By cash on hand, 15th May 1800,				15	13	9
						*L.*301	3	10

William Harley, Dr.

1800.										
May	15.	To cash on hand,	-	-	-	-		L.15	13	9
from		To collection,	-	L.10	8	3½				
June		To ditto,	-	-	21	1	9¾			
July		To ditto,	-	-	17	16	11			
August		To ditto,	-	-	21	1	6			
Sep.		To ditto,	-	-	23	18	6¾			
October		To ditto,	-	-	23	0	7½			
Nov.		To ditto,	-	-	19	3	7¾			
Dec.		To ditto,	-	-	18	18	7¼			
1801.										
January		To ditto,	-	-	22	16	9¼			
February		To ditto,	-	-	15	17	0½			
March		To ditto,	-	-	21	9	9¾			
April		To ditto,	-	-	17	14	7			
May	11.	To ditto,	-	-	7	6	10½			
								240	15	0½
Feb.	2.	To seat-rents,	-	-	267	12	6			
March	31.	To ditto,	-	-	12	19	0			
May	30.	To ditto,	-	-	3	18	9			
Dec.	31.	To ditto,	-	-	14	19	6			
1801.										
May	14.	To ditto,	-	-	19	8	6			
								318	13	3
								L.575	2	0½

1800.									
October	30.	By Mr. Grant, for keeping seat books, *L.*3		3	0				
Nov.	11.	By Mr. Greig's quarter advance,		17	10	0			
1801.									
Feb.	14.	By ditto,		17	10	0			
May	15.	By G. Ewing sundries,		200	0	0			
		By precentor,		13	13	0			
		By William Hodge,		20	0	0			
		By William M'Kenzie,		10	0	0			
		By feu duty,		28	4	4			
		By lighting lamps,		0	10	6			
		By insurance		5	12	0			
							316	2	10
Jan.	17.	By coals,		0	11	6			
Feb.	18.	By ditto,		0	16	9			
	28.	By ditto,		0	5	0			
April	18.	By ditto,		0	16	6			
1800.							2	9	9
Dec.	26.	By D. Matheson candles,		8	17	0			
1801.									
Jan.	19.	By W. Murdoch ditto,		12	5	4			
1801.							21	2	4
Dec.	31.	By loss on bad copper, since opening,		4	16	8			
1801.									
May	15.	By ditto, since December 1800,		3	18	$1\frac{1}{2}$			
							8	14	$9\frac{1}{2}$
							348	9	$8\frac{1}{2}$
		By cash on hand,					226	12	4
							*L.*575	2	$0\frac{1}{2}$

William Harley, Dr.

To cash on hand, being the surplus of the seats and collection after deducting the ordinary expence from the opening of the house till 15th May, 1801,	*L.*	226	12 4

Tabernacle, Glasgow, Cr.

1800.							
Feb. 5.	By J. Morrison's Account, - - - - -	*L.*	3	9	0		
	By Town's Officers at opening, - - - - -		2	19	6		
Dec. 31.	By M. Ogle, books, paper, &c. - - - - -		0	16	1		
1801.							
May 15.	By Singing Boy - -		1	1	0		
	By W. Hodge, Work*, &c.		12	17	8		
						21	3	3
	By Scott repairing flags,		1	7	0		
	By M'Farlane, do. plaster,		1	1	0		
	By J. Robertson, for furnace, - - - - -		38	16	0		
	By R. Watt, wright, -		5	6	4		
	By Buchanan, painter,		12	7	0		
						58	17	4
	By Anderson's Institution, - - - - - -		25	0	0		
	By do. 2s. each to operator, - - - - - -		5	6	0		
						30	6	0
June 5.	By cash, part payment of the Students' quarter, - - - - -					100	0	0
						210	6	7
Oct. 24.	By cash to R. Haldane full, - -					16	5	9
						*L.*226	12	4

Note by Mr. Haldane's Man of Business.

To the above balance brought down, - - -	*L.*	16	5	9
To which add insurance, paid by Mr. Haldane, though credited to Mr. Harley, - - - - - -		5	12	0
	L.	21	17	9

Edinburgh, 2d November, 1801. The above account settled to 15th May last, and the above sum of 21*l.* 17*s.* 9*d.* paid to Mr. Haldane.

Note by Mr. Harley.

The 5*l.* 12*s.* insurance is entered in the proper place, viz. of annual expenditure from May 15th, 1800, to May 15th, 1801.—W. Harley.

(Signed) Robert Haldane,
Greville Ewing.

* *The Book-Case.*

Tabernacle Accompt, from 15th May, 1801, to 15th May, 1802.

William Harley, Dr.

1801.								
May	To Collection, - -	L.	6	18	10½			
June	To ditto, - - - -		18	5	1			
July	To ditto, - - - -		18	10	9½			
August	To ditto, - - - -		20	7	0¾			
Sept.	To ditto, - - - -		13	8	5			
Oct.	To ditto, - - - -		18	0	0			
Nov.	To ditto, - - - -		17	4	4			
Dec.	To ditto, - - - -		13	16	0			
1802.								
Jan.	To ditto, - - - -		10	11	11¼			
Feb.	To ditto, - - - -		20	11	6¾			
March	To ditto, - - - -		18	8	0			
April	To ditto, - - - -		13	2	2			
May	To ditto, - - - -		9	6	6½	198	10	9¼
	To Seat-rents from May 15th, 1801, to May 1802,					235	6	6.
		L.				433	17	3¼
	Balance in Mr. Harley's hand, to be remitted to Mr. Haldane.					43	4	6¾
		L.				390	12	6½

In Account with the Tabernacle, Cr.

1801.								
May	15.	By Mr. Greig,			L.17	10	0	
August	11.	By ditto,			17	10	0	
——	—	By Mr. Ewing,			50	0	0	
Nov.	11.	By ditto,			50	0	0	
——	—	By Mr. Greig,			25	0	0	
1802.								
Feb.	11.	By ditto,			25	0	0	
——	—	By Mr. Ewing,			50	0	0	
May	15.	By ditto,			50	0	0	
								285 0 0
		By Wm. Hodge for door-keeping, &c. from May 15th, 1801, to May 15th, 1802,			20	0	0	
		By Wm. M'Kenzie, for ditto,			8	0	0	
		By N. Ferguson, for Precenting from May 15th, 1801, to May 15th, 1802,			13	13	0	
								41 13 0
1802.								
May	15.	By feu-duty,						28 4 4
1802.		CANDLE.						
Feb.	12.	By D. Mathieson,			4	15	0	
April	24.	By ditto,			4	19	6	
May	15.	By Mr. Paterson,			11	5	0	
								20 19 6
1801.								
Sept.	1.	By Coals,			0	12	0	
Nov.	14.	By ditto,			0	12	0	
Dec.	7.	By ditto,			0	16	9	
1802.								
March	13.	By ditto,			0	12	0	
April	10.	By ditto,			0	17	0	
								3 9 9

Sundry incidental Accounts.

1801.								
May	24.	By cash paid for cleaning and washing the house after whitening			1	10	0	
Sept.	1.	By J. Lindsay, per account,			0	18	0	
——	—	By Wm. Neilson, ditto,			0	15	0	
——	—	By J. Jackson, sawer,			0	4	1½	
Dec.	8.	By J. Russell, a wheel-barrow,			0	12	0	
——	27.	By brushes,			0	4	5	
——	—	By Mr. Ogle, for sundries,			0	4	7	
1802.								
Feb.	10.	By Benthrom Smith,			0	14	7	
——	13.	By Wm. Hodge, per account,			4	16	3	
——	—	By J. Jamieson, causewaying, Sept. 1801,			0	7	0	
March	13.	By ditto, ditto,			1	5	0	
								11 5 11½
								L.390 12 6½

Edinburgh, June 21, 1802. The above account settled to May 15th, 1802.

(Signed) GREVILLE EWING.
ROBERT HALDANE.

Dr. Mr. William Harley in Account Current

1802.							
May	To collections, -	*L.*	12	8	0		
June	To ditto, - - -		14	19	8		
July	To ditto, - - - -		16	16	0		
August	To ditto, - - - -		20	4	2		
Sep.	To ditto, - - - -		14	14	3½		
Oct.	To ditto, - - - -		18	11	0½		
Nov.	To ditto, - - - -		20	17	0½		
Dec.	To ditto, - - - -		17	19	2		
1803.							
Jan.	To ditto, - - - -		14	18	4		
Feb.	To ditto, - - - -		14	0	7¾		
March	To ditto, - - - -		13	11	0¾		
April	To ditto, - - - -		12	7	2½		
May	To ditto, - - - -		8	19	5¾		
						200	6 1½
	To seat rents from May 15th 1802, to 15th May 1803,					264	11 6
						*L.*464	17 7½

with the Tabernacle, Glasgow, &c.

1802.								
May	15.	By Mr. Greig, -	*L.*25	0	0			
August	11.	By — Ewing, - -	50	0	0			
August	11.	By — Greig, - -	25	0	0			
Nov.	11.	By — Ewing, - -	50	0	0			
Nov.	11.	By — Greig, - -	25	0	0			
		By — Ewing, - -	50	0	0			
1803.								
Feb.	11.	By — Greig, - -	25	0	0			
May	15.	By — Ewing, - -	50	0	0			
						300	0	0
		By William Hodge, door-keeper at sundry times, - - -	20	0	0			
		By William M'Kenzie, do. do. -	8	0	0			
		By N. Ferguson precentor, - - - - -	13	13	0			
						41	13	0
		By five waggons of coals at sundry times, -				3	0	0
		By white iron lamps, &c.	2	11	8			
		By painting per account,	8	0	0			
		By Slater, do.	5	8	9			
						16	0	5
		By lighting lamps last year, account not come in at last settlement, - - -				1	11	6
		By Paterson's candle account, - - -	6	19	0			
		By Mathewson's do.	3	19	10			
		By Brown's oil do.	3	4	7			
						14	3	5
		By feu-duty, - - -				28	4	4
		By Balance due, - -				60	4	$11\frac{1}{4}$
						*L.*464	17	$7\frac{1}{4}$

26th July, 1803.

Examined and settled the above Accompt.

(Signed) GREVILLE EWING.
ROBERT HALDANE.

July 29th 1803. Mr. Harley has now paid me the above balance, viz. 60*l.* 4*s.* $11\frac{1}{4}$*d.*

(Signed) ROBERT HALDANE.

Dr. Mr. William Harley in Account Current

1803.					
May	31.	To Collection since the 15th May,	*L.* 6	14	0½
June	30.	To ditto,	9	8	0
July	31.	To ditto,	12	15	10¾
August	31.	To ditto,	14	0	2½
Sept.	30.	To ditto,	11	8	9¾
Oct.	31.	To ditto,	17	4	8¾
Nov.	30.	To ditto,	10	14	1
Dec.	31.	To ditto,	14	1	1½
1804.					
Jan.	31.	To ditto,	9	15	1¾
Feb.	29.	To ditto,	11	1	9½
March	31.	To ditto,	13	2	10¼
April	30.	To ditto,	15	3	10¼
May	15.	To ditto,	7	13	6
		To seat rents from the 15th May, 1803, to this date,	227	12	10
		To balance at credit of new account,	26	14	6½
			*L.*407	11	5

with the Tabernacle, Glasgow, Cr.

1803.							
May	15.	By Mr. Greig, - -	25	0	0		
August	11.	By ditto, - -	25	0	0		
		By Mr. Ewing, - -	50	0	0		
Nov.	11.	By ditto, - - -	50	0	0		
		By Mr. Greig, - -	25	0	0		
1804.							
Feb.	11.	By ditto, - - -	25	0	0		
		By Mr. Ewing, - -	50	0	0		
May	15.	By ditto, - - -	50	0	0		
						300	0 0
		By Wm. Hodge, door-keeper, at sundry times, - - - -	20	0	0		
		By W. M'Kenzie, do.	8	0	0		
		By Dickson Russell, precentor, - - -	10	0	0		
						38	0 0
		By J. and J. Brown's account of oil, - -	4	9	0		
		By David Paterson, candle account, -	12	16	0		
		By D. Mathieson's do.	4	12	0		
		By W. M. Stirling, do. used last year, -	4	10	6		
						26	7 6
		By coals, - - -				2	13 0
		By Wm. Scott, mason, per accounts, -				6	19 0
		By J. Lockhart, per do.				1	1 0
		By M. Ogle, per do.				0	12 5
		By A. Paul, for ashes for road, - -				0	8 0
		By J. and W. Scott, for lamps, - - -				0	10 8
		By Wm. Hodge, altering bench, per accts.				2	0 0
		By W. Smith, per do.				0	15 6
		By feu-duty, - -				28	4 4
						*L.*407	11 5
		By balance brought down, - -				26	14 6½

Edinburgh, June 19, 1804. Examined and settled the above account.

(Signed) ROBERT HALDANE.
GREVILLE EWING.

Dr. Tabernacle Glasgow, in Account Current

1804.							
May	To balance of last account, - - - -				*L.*26	14	6½
1805.							
May	To Cash paid Mr. Ewing at sundry times,	200	0	0			
	To ditto Mr. Henry,	37	10	0			
	To ditto Mr. Haining,	21	3	0			
	To ditto Mr. Gray,	1	1	0			
	To ditto Mr. ———, Preacher, - - - -	1	1	0			
	To ditto Messrs. M'Lea and Paterson,	9	0	0			
					269	15	0
	To Cash paid Wm. Hodge, door-keeper, at sundry times,	20	0	0			
	To Cash paid Wm. M'Kenzie, - - - -	8	0	0			
	To ditto Dickson Russell, precentor, - -	10	0	0			
					38	0	0
	To ditto feu-duty,				28	4	0
	To ditto for coals,				2	6	0
	To ditto Robert Watt repairs, per account,	6	6	0			
	To ditto Murdoch M'Murray & Co. per account, - -	3	10	0			
	To ditto A. Buntrom, per account, - -	0	14	6			
					10	10	6
	To David Matheson, candle account, -	10	8	7			
	To David Paterson, candle account, -	8	10	0			
	To J. & J. Brown's account of oil, - -	3	7	3			
	To J. & G. Buchanan's account of wicks, -	0	5	6			
					22	11	4
	To Cash paid for stabbs per account, - -	0	5	0			
	To ditto advertising seats setting, 1804,	0	5	0	0	10	0
					*L.*398	11	4½
May	15. To balance due Mr. Harley by Mr. Robert Haldane, - - -				31	9	10½

with William Harley (from 15th May, 1804, to 15th May, 1805) Cr.

1804.							
May	31.	By Cash collected at the door since the 15th, - - - - -	7	13	6		
June	30.	By ditto this month,	15	3	3¾		
July	31.	By ditto,	12	16	1½		
August	31.	By ditto,	13	4	3¾		
Sept.	30.	By ditto,	14	3	7		
Oct.	31.	By ditto,	9	6	3½		
Nov.	30.	By ditto,	14	2	4¼		
Dec.	31.	By ditto,	16	0	1½		
1805.							
Jan.	31.	By ditto,	14	13	5		
Feb.	28.	By ditto,	13	11	9¾		
March	31.	By ditto,	13	19	6½		
April	30.	By ditto,	15	10	5		
May	15.	By ditto,	7	8	2½		
						*L.*167	13 0
		By seat-rents for 1804, - - - - -				199	8 6
		By balance, - - - - - - - - -				31	9 10½
						*L.*398	11 4½

Glasgow, July 23d, 1805, settled the above,

(Signed) ROBERT HALDANE.
GREVILLE EWING.

Dr. Tabernacle, Glasgow, in Account Current

	To cash, Mr. Ewing, at sundries, -	200	0	0			
	To do. Mr. Henry, -	75	0	0			
	To do. Wm. Hodge, door-keeper, -	20	0	0			
	To do. W. M'Kenzie, ditto, - - - - -	8	0	0			
	To do. Dickson Russell, precentor, - -	10	0	0			
					313	0	0
1807.							
May 15.	To do. per feu-duty,				28	4	0
	To do. D. Mathieson, candle, - - - -	14	17	6			
	To do. P. Smith, per account, - - -	6	18	4			
	To do. Lyon & Boggie,	0	13	11			
	To do. Bell & M'Callum,	1	2	3			
	To do. Wm. Drew, -	0	7	8			
	To do. John Smith, -	4	0	0			
	To do. Alex. Cowan,	0	10	0			
	To do. J. & J. Brown,	0	6	6			
	To do. Liddell & Burns,	1	7	0			
	To do. Wm. Hodge,	0	6	7			
					30	9	9
	To balance paid Mr. Haldane,				60	0	$0\frac{1}{2}$
					*L.*431	13	$9\frac{1}{2}$

The above 60*l.* 0*s.* $0\frac{1}{2}$*d.* is paid to me, R. H.

with William Harley, Cr.
(*Say from 15th May, 1806, to 15th May, 1807.*)

1806.								
May	31.	By Cash collected since the 15th, - - -	L.	7	15	10		
June	30.	By ditto, this month,		14	6	6½		
July	31.	By ditto, - - - - -		14	13	0		
Aug.	31.	By ditto, - - - - -		15	2	11½		
Sept.	30.	By ditto, - - - -		15	17	5		
Oct.	31.	By ditto, - - - - -		17	2	8½		
Nov.	30.	By ditto, - - - - -		16	13	8½		
Dec.	31.	By ditto, - - - - -		10	14	0		
1807.								
Jan.	31.	By ditto, - - - - -		17	11	6		
Feb.	28.	By ditto, - - - - -		18	2	0		
March	31.	By ditto, - - - - -		18	6	7		
April	30.	By ditto, - - - - -		13	18	4½		
May	15.	By ditto, - - - - -		6	16	0½		
							187	0 8
		By seat-rents for 1806,					243	17 9
		By balance, 1806,					0	15 4½
							*L.*431	13 9½

(Signed) ROBERT HALDANE,
GREVILLE EWING.

Dr. Tabernacle Glasgow, in Account Current

		To cash to Mr. Ewing at sundries, - L.	200	0	0		
		To ditto Mr. Henry,	75	0	0		
		To ditto W. Hodge, door-keeper, - -	20	0	0		
		To ditto W. M'Kenzie,	8	0	0		
		To ditto Dickson Russell, precentor, -	10	0	0		
						313	0	0
1806.								
May	15.	To ditto for feu-duty,				28	4	0
		To ditto for sundry jobbings, - - -	1	0	5			
Feb.	8.	To ditto A. Cowan, per account, - -	10	5	4			
March	25.	To ditto J. Johnston, account of coals,	1	18	0			
		To ditto, ditto, and others, account of candles, - - -	25	13	6			
May	1.	To ditto Murdoch & M'Murray, per account, - - -	0	18	0			
	7.	To ditto P. Macfarlane, per account,	1	1	0			
	23.	To ditto W. Scott, do.	3	12	6			
		To ditto Brushes, do.	0	9	11			
						44	18	8
						386	2	8
		To balance due by Mr. Haldane last year, - - - - - - - -				31	9	10½
						417	12	6½
		To balance due by Mr. Harley,				0	15	4½
						418	7	11

with William Harley, from 15th May, 1805, to 15th May, 1806, Cr.

1805.								
May	31.	By cash collected since the 15th, - - -		7	3	1½		
June	30.	By ditto this month,		14	2	9¼		
July	31.	By	ditto,	15	6	8½		
August	31.	By	ditto,	14	13	6½		
Sept.	30.	By	ditto,	20	15	10½		
Oct.	31.	By	ditto,	15	14	6¼		
Nov.	30.	By	ditto,	13	13	3½		
Dec.	31	By	ditto,	16	7	7¼		
1806.								
Jan.	31.	By	ditto,	12	4	11¾		
Feb.	28.	By	ditto,	15	3	4½		
March	31.	By	ditto,	18	0	7½		
April	30.	By	ditto,	15	14	6		
May	15.	By	ditto,	7	13	2½		
							186	14 2
		By seat-rents for 1805,					231	13 9
							*L.*418	7 11

(Signed) ROBERT HALDANE.
GREVILLE EWING.

N. B. This Accompt ought to have been inserted before the preceding one.

Dr. Tabernacle Glasgow, in Account Current

1807.							
May	To cash paid Mr. Ewing,	200	0	0			
	To ditto, Mr. Henry,	18	15	0			
	To ditto, Mr. Philips,	20	0	0			
	To ditto, sundry assistances,	27	6	0			
	To ditto, William Hodge, door-keeper,	20	0	0			
	To ditto, William M'Kenzie, do.	4	0	0			
	To ditto, Dickson Russel,	10	0	0			
					300	1	0
	To ditto, feu-duty,				28	4	0
June	To ditto, Mrs. Hodge for sweeping,	0	3	6			
August 18.	To ditto, Peter Smith per accompt,	1	1	0			
	To ditto, Rob. Watt,	0	10	8½			
Sep. 11.	To ditto, James Donaldson,	4	12	0			
	To ditto, David Matheson, candles,	14	8	0			
	To ditto, Wm. Drew per accompt,	0	4	6			
Dec. 11.	To ditto, Wm. Buchanan,	11	5	1			
Feb. 10.	To ditto, Wm. Hodge for pullies,	0	5	0			
	To ditto, James Johnston coals,	2	2	0			
					34	11	9½
	Balance,				51	16	0¾
					*L.*414	12	10¼

June 16th. This day balance paid to me by Mr. Harley.

R. H.

with Wm. Harley, from 15th May 1807, *to 15th May* 1808, *Cr.*

May	31.	By cash collected since the 15th,	*L.*	10	1	3		
June	30.	By ditto this month,		14	6	5		
July	31.	By ditto,		13	14	7½		
August	31.	By ditto,		16	13	0½		
Sep.	30.	By ditto,		13	14	1½		
Oct.	31.	By ditto,		14	9	10½		
Nov.	30.	By ditto,		13	7	6		
Dec.	31.	By ditto,		11	12	10½		
1808.								
Jan.	31.	By ditto,		15	19	4½		
Feb.	29.	By ditto,		12	17	11		
March	31.	By ditto,		11	12	7		
April	30.	By ditto,		10	15	9½		
May	15.	By ditto,		8	17	11¼		
							168	3 4¼
		By seat-rents from May 1807, to May 1808,					246	9 6

*L.*414 12 10¼

(Signed) Robert Haldane.
Greville Ewing.

Abstract of the preceding Accounts, showing the amount of money received by Mr. Haldane from the Tabernacle up to May, 1808.

May 15, 1801.	Balance per account this date, -				*L.* 21	17	9
	Add the following articles, which ought to have been in another account, being quite distinct from the funds of the Tabernacle.						
—— —	Wm. Hodge, work, &c. (the book case) -	*L.*12	17	8			
—— —	Anderson's Institution, students' fees, - -	25	0	0			
—— —	Ditto, Operator, ditto, 2*s.* each, - - - -	5	6	0			
June 5. —	Part payment of the Student's quarter, -	*L.*100	0	0			
					143	3	8
	Proper Balance, 15th May, 1801,				165	1	5
May, 1802.	Balance, per account, - - - - -				43	4	$6\frac{3}{4}$
May, 1803.	Ditto ditto, - - - - - - -				60	4	$11\frac{1}{4}$
May, 1804.	There was a deficiency of 26*l.* 14*s.* $6\frac{1}{2}$*d.* which was unnecessarily carried to debit of the Tabernacle account for 1805, because in case of deficiency Mr. H. was bound to pay the feu-duty.						
May, 1805.	A deficiency again of 31*l.* 9*s.* $10\frac{1}{2}$*d.* including the 26*l.* 14*s.* $6\frac{1}{2}$*d.* brought to debit from last year, This year standing by itself, would have been deficient only 4*l.* 15*s.* 4*d.* *						
May, 1806.	Balance, per account, - - - - - -				0	15	$4\frac{1}{2}$
May, 1807.	Ditto, ditto, - - - - - -				60	0	$0\frac{1}{4}$
May, 1808.	Ditto, ditto, - - - - - -				51	16	$0\frac{3}{4}$
	Total received by Mr. H. without being called on to make up the deficiencies, - - - - - - -				*L.*381	2	$4\frac{1}{4}$

* As Mr. H. received the balances, when they were in his favour, he ought to have paid for the deficiencies in 1804 and 1805, as the contract bound him to make up the feu duty of 28*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.* per annum, when the funds were not sufficient for that purpose. The contract evidently bears that every year should stand by itself. Mr. H. had no right in any year to make a prospective calculation upon the next. Had the funds been deficient a year or two longer; they would have considerably exceeded the value of the feu, and in proportion as that was exceeded, I must have been short of my salary.

In no part of his pamphlet does Mr. Haldane descend so much to puerilities for obtaining a temporary triumph, as where he tries to represent me as not speaking the truth, in regard to matter of fact. I have said, in page 137 of my Statement, "They maintain, that any two Christians make a "church, and that any meeting of Christians on the Lord's "day, however casual, ambulatory, and even private, (if "strangers be not absolutely excluded,) may act in all re- "spects, as a church. In short, any company of Christians "is a church; and a church, though destitute of office-bear- "ers, is every thing. If two or three of my family be agreed "as Christians, to meet together on the Lord's day, whether "we be visited or not by a neighbour or two of the same "description; it is only necessary for somebody to give "thanks, before bread and wine are handed about; and this "may be done, as showing the Lord's death till he come, "although the meeting were purely accidental. This is "no overcharged imaginary picture. It is taken from what "is *known* to have been done." To enable himself to contradict me, Mr. Haldane takes for granted, what nothing in my Statement gave him the smallest warrant to do in any exclusive sense, that I refer to Mr. Ballantine and him. He adds, (Letters, page 69,) "If so, I inform him that his "picture is taken from what is known *not* to have been done;" and then taunts me with the manner in which I addressed Professor Robinson, on an occasion which, it is insinuated, was of a similar nature.—In return for Mr. Haldane's information, I will lay some of mine also, before the reader; only premising that, however new it may be to many, I shall believe, till I see whether he can deny it, that all I am going to state, was perfectly known to Mr. Haldane, when he wrote the sentence now quoted. It is known, then, that when Mr. James Haldane was at Dumfries, he ate the Lord's Supper with Mrs. Haldane in their own lodgings, on the Lord's day evening. It is known, that when Mr. Walker of Dublin was on a visit to Edinburgh, he ate the Lord's Supper with a Christian friend who had accompanied him from Ireland, and another who was studying medicine at Edinburgh, in the lodgings of the latter; and although I have never taken the trouble to collect particular proof on the subject, I have no doubt that this has, for some time, been Mr. Walker's constant and avowed practice on all similar occasions. As to Mr. Robert Haldane and Mr. Ballantine, I think Mr. Haldane will acknowledge, that his own account of their expedition

to Newcastle was somewhat to this purpose; that they set out without having formed any plan, but that in the course of conversation with each other, on the way, or on the spot, they digested a scheme of church order, such as they were fully persuaded, was according to the mind of Christ; that in conformity to this *digested* scheme, they appeared at Newcastle in the character of two Christian men, with their wives and servants, (or perhaps only the wife and servant of one of them,) and in that character publicly exhorted one another, and mutually dispensed the Lord's Supper, in the Lord's day forenoons, and preached in the afternoons and evenings. At present, I say nothing at all concerning these practices. I merely ask my reader whether I did not speak the truth when I said: "This is no overcharged imaginary picture. It is taken from "what is known to have been done. If the advocates of this "scheme happen to be from home, with a Christian party, "they eat the Lord's Supper, every Lord's day, whether they "meet with a Christian church or not. Their practice may "show whither they would lead us.

In page 210 of my Statement, I have said that since withdrawing my subscription from the Westminster Confession of faith, the doctrines which I preach, "are no longer modified by feelings of previous stipulation." In a note to one of his letters, p. 52, Mr. Haldane exclaims, "A very "remarkable confession!" I suppose that to men of ordinary understanding, it will seem a dictate of common honesty, that while a man's subscription remains at any confession of faith, he should feel himself bound in conscience not knowingly to contradict it, and that when he becomes conscious of a change of sentiment, he should, (after such deliberate consideration, as a step so important demands,) first withdraw his subscription, and then enjoy his liberty. This was all that I meant by the above confession. I do not wonder, however, that to Mr. Haldane it should seem "a "very remarkable" one. It is, no doubt, very foreign from his present avowed principles of action. Certainly his conduct towards me is "modified by NO feelings of previous "stipulation."

At page 88 of his pamphlet, Mr. Haldane gives the following note. "In a note at this place, (my Animadversions, "page 45,) Mr. Ewing says, 'Compare Mat. xviii. 15—20. "'with all the synodical decrees, ecumenical decisions, "'canon laws, papal bulls, episcopal mandates, and pastoral "'admonitions which have been enacted, ordained, or issued

" ' since the days of the Apostles.'—Good, very good, go on " —and with all the stamped bonds, church-covenants, and " printed regulations which have been extended, prepared, " and foisted into the churches."—I fancy I like this supplement to my note, a good deal better than the gentleman who has made it. It is good, very good, let us go on,—whatever I may think of the principle, I shall not refuse the practice—provided the author will go before me. Let him, then, give up all the stamped bonds, by which he holds from churches security for money, or rights of places of worship, and accept in stead of them, conjunctly and severally, Matth. xviii. 15—20.; and I hereby publicly declare, that I shall dispose of my stamped bond in the same way. If he will not, I shall be entitled to apply his own words, " Here let candour decide between Mr. Haldane " and me. Shall either party-spirit or worldly interest so " far blind our minds as to induce us to condemn and " expose Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians, " and at the same time to conceal or to spare the *popery* of " Independents? Either let us follow out the principles " which we adopt, or abandon them altogether."

I take this opportunity of remarking, that I believe my only unpardonable sin, in this whole controversy, has been, that I have refused " to conceal or to spare either the *popery* " or the POPE of independents." That both have been found in our churches, with as real tyranny, as ever was experienced at Rome in the darkest age, is a fact which many can attest from dear-bought experience. If this fact shall be denied, it will require no more confidence to do so, than was requisite to give it existence. Many a well-meaning man has gone to Rome to kiss the Pope's toe, and has had it from the first authority, even from his own mouth, with every possible profession of humility, and with the utmost solemnity of asseveration, that there was not a particle of tyranny in his whole system. Among the many animadversions made on my Statement, I have not yet observed any thing said by Mr. Haldane or his associates on one passage in page 116, although I cannot suppose it to have escaped their notice. " Tenthly, The hostility of some to the ap- " pointment of one bishop in a church, seems to be entirely " directed against the bishop's office. They have no objec- " tion, on general principles, to the exercise of superior " power by an individual, in a church of Christ. A person, " without office, may have an effective, though nameless

" influence, not only in one, but in fifty churches; yet all is " well." The disposition to conceal or to spare this *popery* of Independents is the more remarkable, that one of the patronised publications has, in the table of contents, the following article: " Mr. Ewing's ten arguments against a " plurality of elders in one church examined." When the writer comes, however, to the tenth one, he thinks proper to pass it over in silence, and pretends to understand the next paragraph which occurs in page 117, as the tenth argument, although he must have seen, that it was a complete transition from particular arguments to the obviating of an objection, which was likely to be brought against many of them at once. This is a specimen of the *uprightness* with which my arguments have been examined. It is, indeed, a pity that " either party-spirit or worldly interest should so far blind " our minds as to induce us to conceal or to spare the *popery* " of Independents."

In his Letters, page 33, Mr. Haldane addresses me thus: " Indeed, my Dear Sir, I am not acting from any irritation " against you." Page 53, " I am not actuated by any " covetous principle, or by dislike to you." Again, in his Introduction, page 8, " I am conscious that I am not " actuated by any spirit of animosity against him," Lastly, in his letter to Mr. Harley, (see above, p. 209,) " You may " rest assured that I am actuated by no spirit of dislike to " you, or Mr. Ewing, or to the church with which you are " connected." If any reader of his pamphlet can believe these protestations (which I do not wonder it should be felt necessary to make again and again,) far be it from me to disturb his faith. I presume not to judge in a case in which I am so nearly concerned. God only can see the real motives of any man; and I confess that the motives of Mr. Haldane appear to me to be often further removed from human observation, than those of most other men. My readers, however, will, I dare say, admit the justice of two remarks, which I make, not on the motives, but on the work, of Mr. Haldane. On this work, my first remark is, that it is the greatest effort, which I have ever seen made, by any individual, or combination of individuals, from any motive whatsoever, to ruin the comfort, and the usefulness, of a minister of the gospel. My second remark is, that it is the most unblushing endeavour, which I have ever heard of, since the days of the Jesuits, to plead from the word of God in opposition to the ties of moral obligation.

The publication of such a work was entirely unnecessary. The author might have said all that he had to say to me, in private conversation, in the presence, or (if he had chosen) under the arbitration of mutual friends; and might, in that way, have been, at this moment, as near as he is, to the attainment of his object. The misrepresentation, which he pleads as his apology, (Preface, page 3d,) I take to be nothing else, than the unavoidable consequence of his own unjustifiable and mysterious behaviour. Reports may be exaggerated on any subject; but when there is so much foundation for them, as in the case of Mr. Haldane, it is not by quibbling on words; by ill-supported contradictions, however bold; nor by attempts to injure the character of another, however desperate; that they can be set at rest. To set any thing at rest, indeed, seems to be no part of his plan. Unless he shall be hindered by that Almighty Being, who "restraineth the remainder of "the wrath of man;" I am prepared, by what has been already written, to expect the utmost obstinacy of contention; in the course of which, nothing will be omitted that can hurt my feelings, alienate my friends, rob me of any portion I may possess of public regard, interrupt my endeavours, and prevent my success, in a better cause. I have already been exceedingly harassed and impeded, in the prosecution of my studies, and in writings which were once acknowledged to be important, as well as in the discharge of my pastoral duties. How kind would it have been, had Mr. Haldane never persuaded me to accept, what he cannot allow me peaceably to possess! I pity him. I pray for him. At one period I certainly esteemed him an eminent Christian; but I have long been truly at a loss what to think. Much good, has, I believe, followed some of his plans, and, I greatly fear, much evil also. His late behaviour, not to me only, but to many others, seems utterly irreconcileable with the most obvious principles of Christianity. It really confounds me to observe the avidity with which he appears to hunt after disgrace; and the infatuation with which he ascribes it all, when he meets with it, from whatever cause or quarter, to his faithfulness as a disciple in bearing the cross of his Lord. I lament my misfortune in having ever been so closely connected with a gentleman, who seems to have acquired an irresistible propensity for exposing both himself and his neighbours; yet I desire to be thankful that I know no reason why I should be afraid of him, or of any man; and, I hope, that the facts and documents, which I have now laid before the public,

will exempt me from the trouble of writing more in my own defence. Whatever extraordinary assertions may be made, judicious readers will surely receive future representations, with a recollection of the evidence, on which former ones have been shown to require correction.

In the introduction I have said, "I hope no one will suppose, that my object in publishing the following pages, is "to engage in a struggle with Mr. Haldane, for the possession "of the Tabernacle at Glasgow." It must now be perceived, that the possession of it has been, almost from the very beginning, one of the greatest sources of trial in my lot. When I agreed to go to Glasgow, I was led to believe, that I should have nothing to do, but to preach the gospel, and attend to other duties of the same spiritual nature. I had hardly drawn breath there, when I was involved in the most unexpected discussions about temporal affairs; and stunned with a language which I little understood. "They ought to buy the "house—a fair price betwixt us—pay by instalments—clear "off the debt in ten years—500*l.* for a first payment—borrow "money on the house—give me security independent of the "house—sit at 5 per cent. instead of $7\frac{1}{2}$—must have an "equivalent—the whole cost, excepting 1000*l.* and this large "subscription on certain regulations—no risk—if the scheme "fail, the house wholly to revert to me or my heirs—in "that case, I shall refund if I have got any thing *more* than "interest for my money, and the lenders shall be repaid, or "shall at least have a dividend, *if* there be any remainder *after* "I am paid." What is the strain now? To say plainly, I am angry, and want to make you feel my resentment; or, I am tired of you, and of Tabernacles, and want my money for another purpose; would be but a moderate flight of genius. It must be confessed, that Mr. Haldane rises to the sublime. With the most ineffable command of countenance, he comes forward to read a recantation of what he calls his sin; to demand, at the same time, exemption from all loss, and all blame, as his sin, though indeed enormous, is, in him, the pure result of "ignorance,"—"inexperience,"—and "integrity of conduct from first to last standing unimpeached;" to show, however, his abhorrence of all iniquity, he feels bound in duty to lay hold of his fellow sinner, who, at worst, is only the victim of his own subtlety; from him, he insists on payment of the uttermost farthing; and, because he cannot legally enforce his demand, he persecutes him with accusations, threats, and insidious offers of dishonourable and delu-

sive compromise, in a series of letters, by the succession of which, he tries increasingly to disturb his peace, by private circulation to wound his character, and, finally, by publication, to insult, while, as he hopes, he shall be able to overwhelm him:—all this is done with the sweetest composure, with the most insinuating mildness of address, with the most heart-felt approbation and complacency, nay, with the most pious breathings of benevolence; doing me no wrong, bewailing my wickedness, writing merely what is dictated by a sense of duty, faithfully declining to approve of my bad conduct, but wishing me well both in the present and future world.

In the Introduction I have also said, "Whether I should "resist Mr. Haldane's demand, or rather take wrong, is a ques- "tion which I am willing that others should help me to deter- "mine." It gives me much satisfaction to find, that most of my friends are (independently of the merits of the question) ready to admit, that the possession of the Tabernacle is an unworthy subject of contest. This opinion will, I have no doubt, be confirmed by the present publication. From the manner in which Mr. Haldane has challenged me to controversy, I conclude, that he had more hope of success from the impression which he could make on my spirit and feelings, than from that which he could make on my understanding or conscience. But let others judge. The reader has seen, that I accepted the Tabernacle in consequence of being deceived as to the intentions of the proprietor, unless, indeed, he conceived intentions afterwards which he alleged to be as old as the original scheme:—that I continued in it in consequence of being deceived by many letters, as well as conversations of his own, and by an authorised letter of a mutual friend, as to the expectations which the proprietor would thenceforward entertain from the church and congregation:—that his refusal to make any settlement for behoof of the church, under pretence of standing to the contract between him and me, is liable to the suspicion that he knew, or at least believed, he could set aside that contract whenever he pleased:—that my friends and I have been exposed, for several years, to various vexations from the proprietor's management of a seminary for the education of young men for the ministry, and of an institution called, The Society for Propagating the Gospel at Home:—that we have been undermined by secret influence in the conducting of the Missionary Magazine, and by clandestine measures used with the students, to form them for subverting the

churches with which they were in communion:—that many of the preachers, after being half-starved, have been abandoned:—that the confidence of the churches has been abused:—that the aid, which they have accepted, has become an occasion of general embarrassment, in consequence of sudden and unprecedented demands:—that, in his transactions with me, every proposal came from himself, and yet every one is now turned into a handle against me:—that he can plead for deserting others, that nothing has passed between him and them which could infer obligation on either side; but that he can plead with equal ardour against me, the very things which do infer such obligation:—that my character has been attacked, by the circulation of reports, which, though his own measures produced them, he never was at pains to check, and is now eager to countenance:—that while he unwarrantably accuses me of attempting to check freedom of inquiry in others, he seeks to bring me into reproach and trouble, because I assert my right to exercise it myself:—that he has long been watching an opportunity to drive me from a situation, in which I would not be his agent for the recovery of his money, because I never undertook to recover it, and would have refused to have been concerned in its destination at all, unless he had made me believe, that he had no desire to recover it:—that now he has made a demand of the most unjustifiable nature, under pretence of scruples which he does not appear to feel, by arguments which are fallacious, or founded in misrepresentation:—that he has urged this demand in a very injurious manner, teasing me with insidious proposals and vexatious letters, calculated to deceive others, but not to convince, or to conciliate me; tampering with church-members, and members of connected churches, to produce or to foment jealousy, and alienation; abusing my friends who remonstrated against his behaviour; endeavouring to frighten me from the house, which he was bound to uphold, by an exaggerated report, (formerly concealed from me,) of its insufficiency; throwing copies of his letters into a private circulation, without the documents necessary to their being understood; and at last bringing them before the public, so partially, and with such mutilations, as to conceal the manner in which he had really behaved.

The success, which can attend measures like these, I desire not to obtain. In such a contest, indeed, victory must, at all events, be too dear-bought. I would not repeat the task, which I am thankful I have now nearly finished, for

twice the value of the Glasgow Tabernacle, or of all the advantages which the possession of it could insure. It holds, indeed, a large congregation, which is a very wide field of usefulness; but if I cannot remain in it without molestation, (which is very evidently the case,) no one can justly blame me for going away. The scattering of the people, and any other evil consequences which may ensue, must lie with him, who is the author of the mischief. But I call on every member of the church, and every individual of the congregation, to join me in saying " Lord, lay not these sins to his charge.'

I am far from expecting, that this publication may not receive a very plausible answer. But I have the fearless testimony of conscience, that, to the best of my knowledge and recollection, I have told the truth. I have taken pains to ascertain every point, for the interest of Mr. Haldane, as well as of myself. I am not aware that I have made any malicious or unnecessary exposure: any artful or improper concealment. I had nothing to conceal; and now, since the occasion required it, I have told every thing. I have no hope that all my readers are to agree with me on general principles, or to approve of my spirit and conduct in all that I have done. I pretend not to be perfect; I confess myself a sinner; but when loaded with odious and unfounded reproaches, I am entitled to plead, Not guilty.

I feel that I am, at present, in a critical situation. But with divine direction, for which I am encouraged to pray and to hope, all shall be well. In whatever way I shall act, my conduct may become the subject of animadversion; and those perhaps, may most loudly condemn, who have conspired to bring me into the difficulties, of which they take advantage. " But with me it is a very small thing, that I should be " judged of them, or of man's judgement." They and I must soon appear before a higher tribunal than that of human opinion. May none of us be then confronted as opposite parties! From the heart I wish them every blessing: and as to myself, conscious of much guilt and depravity, of many sins known only to God, as well as of many discoverable by fellow-creatures; aware of proneness to transgress in all cases, especially amidst the temptations and difficulties of a public station; I can only say, God be merciful to me a sinner; may I never cause grief to the people of God; may I never give occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme; so long as I live, may I be honoured to preach, and, in some measure, to adorn the gospel of Christ.

APPENDIX.

AFTER the preceding sheets were sent to the Press, I received the following Letter from Mr. ORME, one of my brethren in the ministry at Perth, with whom I had no previous correspondence on the subject.

Perth, April 18th, 1809.

MY DEAR SIR,

I have been reading Mr. Haldane's Letters to you respecting the Tabernacle. I sincerely regret their publication on his account. As they seem plainly to be published from a personal pique, with a design to give circulation to his sentiments on some disputed points, and if possible to make a diversion in your church in favour of the new scheme, by censuring your conduct so severely. I understand you are intending to publish an answer, which is no doubt absolutely necessary. I hope you will be able to correct many mistakes, and place the subject in a very different point of view. As Mr. H. refers, in these Letters, to his conduct to others as well as to you, and as he seems to think that, "Integrity of conduct from first to last, will stand unimpeached," I have thought it right to send you a statement of a few particulars, which do not correspond with this assertion. Had not Mr. H. introduced every thing in these Letters that could at all serve his purpose, and endeavoured to make the most of every trifling circumstance, I should probably have allowed what has come under my observation to sleep in perpetual silence; but after the manner in which he has acted to you, I think it right to afford you all the advantage possible in your reply.

You will probably have heard of what has taken place of late in the church in Perth. I am sorry that Mr. H. should have had such a hand in the division that happened in it, and that he should have acted to us in the manner in which he has done since.

In page 15 of the Letters, he says, "In regard to the "church, they continue to occupy the house wholly at your

" pleasure. Is not this a strong temptation implicitly to sub-
" mit, whenever you may please to impose or withhold."
Now this is exactly the situation in which Mr. H. has stood to the church here for a number of years. Though the house was originally raised by subscription, he was allowed to buy up the debts upon it, and the sole right of the property was vested in him, and every thing given his own way, as the church reposed the most unlimited confidence in him. The tenure by which they have held this house, at least for several years, was their following out his sentiments. About two years and a half ago the church thought that two pastors were necessary. He understood that they had an eye to Mr. Watson of Musselburgh, at which he was exceedingly displeased, and caused his man of business to write again and again, demanding his interest, after the church had understood that he would not distress them for it. It could be with no other view, than to prevent the church taking that step, as he declared, that if they did, it would be converted into a Relief meeting house, which he would never countenance. The church was so distressed by this business, and feeling the necessity of some other teacher besides him who was then in the church, that they sent two of their number to speak with him on the subject, when he agreed, in the prospect of what was likely to take place, not to trouble them for interest. At their desire *he* was to send a person to the church, and I was pitched upon for this purpose. From the instructions I then received, I am fully persuaded that I was dispatched to Perth with the very intention of accomplishing a revolution in the order of the church. My inexperience, and confidence in Mr. H. rendered me a proper instrument of his, and led me into some of his schemes, which I have since sincerely regretted. So long as the church continued to follow the plan he so warmly supports, he said nothing about the house, nor received any interest; but as soon as they were not disposed to follow any farther, and a small party broke off about baptism and exhortation, which entered warmly into his whole system, he then tacitly refused to acknowledge us any longer as a church, and whatever inconvenience it might subject us to, he would not allow us to retain the house beyond the term of Whitsunday, and expressed his regret, that the other party did not retain the house. I was so strongly convinced of the force of what he says to you, when applied to himself, that I could not help quoting his own language, in my last letter to him. " For when they (other churches)

" apply to you for assistance, you inquire into their senti-
" ments and practices, and give or withhold, according as
" these correspond with your own. This must of course be
" a great temptation thrown in the way of other churches,"
p. 17. Never were the words of Nathan to David more applicable, " Thou art the man!" As soon as our sentiments and practices did not correspond with his, all countenance was immediately refused, and our very existence as a church of Christ denied. It is unfair in the extreme for Mr. H. to write so to you, and act in the manner he has done to us. His conduct to us leads me much to question his sincerity, when he says to you, " I would now say further, that it was
" never my intention to put you and the church to any un-
" reasonable inconvenience. I should willingly allow a cer-
" tain time, on terms that might be arranged, for you to pro-
" vide yourselves in a house, if you should wish to build a
" new one, which I should suppose would be most eligible."
Now, Sir, we have every claim that you have, (abating the bond) and some which you have not, and yet Mr. H. will not allow us a certain time to provide for ourselves. He solemnly promised to the church, through Mr. Little, which he does not now deny, that he would not ask above £50 yearly interest, if they would pay him that. After reminding him of this in our last letter, we state as follows: " We do not re-
" quest you to give us active support, all we ask is, that you
" allow us to retain the house, for a year at least, as we
" cannot now be accommodated, for which we are willing to
" pay you the £50 of interest." Notwithstanding this reasonable proposal, we are not to be allowed to remain, either for love or money. Mr. H. refuses to correspond with us as a church on the business, nor will he give us a fair account of the state of matters, to which we are justly entitled, but places the gift of the house, and all the other matters, in the hands of one who left us, from whom we can expect no favour, and to whom he has given the promise of the Tabernacle. He will not give us a direct answer, and yet he has determined that we shall go out, whatever inconvenience it may put us to. Those who come into it, will no doubt hold it by the same tenure that we have done, or else he will alienate his talents contrary to the doctrine of the letters. Mr. H. professes to give up his legal claim, and reasons with you on Christian principles. We have done the same, and are astonished to find that he will not reason with us on Christian principles. While he takes advantage of every

thing in his favour, he pays no attention to the most solemn promises, and passes in silent neglect every thing that has been said to him from the scriptures. I can fully prove this by the production of our correspondence, were it necessary. His conduct here is opposed to the fundamental principle on which he reasons in these letters. Is this integrity and uprightness of conduct?

Mr. H. blames you for not speaking to him according to his desire, and thinks that he acted very properly in wishing to converse with you alone. What a pity he did not always act in this manner! I have to accuse him of the same thing, and what is worse, of sowing discord among brethren. A considerable time ago, from a person in Perth, *not connected with the church*, he received some distorted representations of my sentiments and conduct. Without ever speaking or writing to me on the subject, some time after he saw two persons belonging to the church, one of them my late colleague, and on the improper representations he had got, and what they said to him, he enlarged on the evils of my conduct, placed them in the strongest light, and reasoned with them on the sinfulness of allowing me to retain my office in the church, while all this time I was ignorant that I had ever done evil. I saw himself in Edinburgh a good while after, when he told me for the first time of what was going on, and what he had done; and likewise told me, what was not true, that he had all his information from persons in the church, and particularly my colleague, when I have certain evidence, that all the charges fulminated against me were stated to him by a person *out of the church*. When I mentioned this to him in a letter he did not deny it. I mentioned likewise to him, "That I do think you ought not to have given advices to "Messrs. M. & S. or interfered betwixt them and me, previous "to your either seeing or writing to me, especially as they I "suppose told you they had never spoken to myself." Had I any connexion with the church of which Mr. H. is a member, I should certainly deal with him for receiving reports to my prejudice, for speaking to others about them and not to myself, for giving me an unfair statement of the manner in which he received his information, and refusing to acknowledge that he had done wrong when I wrote to him about it. His improper interference with the church of Perth has been attended with the most unhappy consequences. After this, can he blame you for going to Bernard's Rooms, or refusing to speak with him? "First pluck out the beam out of thine own eye,

"and then thou shalt see clearly to pull the mote out of thy "brother's eye." But Mr. H. has one law for himself, and another for other people. He told me I was a novice. I must have proved myself to be so, could I pass over such palpable inconsistencies, in one whose experience and confidence ought to have taught him to shew me a better example.

Mr H courts inquiry, and anticipates the happy consequences that must result from it. Now that he has begun it I am satisfied it should go on. He exclaims against human influence, but I am fully convinced that no man since the days of the Apostles, has struggled harder for influence over churches of Christ, or has used more indirect means to obtain and support it. The instances mentioned in this letter are not the only ones which have come under my observation, and in which I have been concerned. But I forbear stating others, as what I have brought forward, must convince you, that some of the principles and assertions in the letters to you, are inconsistent with different parts of his conduct both to the church and me. And as he is so good at calling others to repentance, and making them subjects of public discipline, it is right to take the same plan with himself. His Publication reminded me of his words a few years ago at a church meeting. A young man was brought before the church for bringing some charges against Mr. J. H. He threw out an insinuation that he would publish. On which Mr. R. H. observed, that if any thing of this nature should make its appearance, he would consider it a decisive proof that he was destitute of the grace of God. I dare say he would not like this to be applied to himself. Though I believe there was as little call for the one as the other, and as little good to be done by it.

If any thing in this letter can be useful to you, you are extremely welcome to it. If you require any further explanation I shall be very willing to afford it, if in my power; or if you would like to see our correspondence I could forward it to you, but I have given you the most material part of it. I pledge myself as to the accuracy of the statements, and care not how they make their appearance. Had Mr. H. used us either as a gentleman, a man of feeling, or a Christian, I never should have made any use of these things. But it is passing strange, that he should assert, that he has not distressed the churches, when he is determined to turn the church in the Tabernacle into the streets, when even his friends being judges they cannot be benefited by it. As a proof that Mr. H. is influenced by mere opposition to us, I shall quote the words of

the person with whom he corresponds on the subject of the house, in a letter to me. 'I had last post a letter from Mr. R. H. urging us to retain possession of the Tabernacle, in which he states as follows: "I should not suppose, that as "matters now stand, it even can be expected or required, that "you and your friends with whom I am united in sentiment, "should leave a house which belongs to me, to be occupied "by those of opposite sentiments to us both." '*Notwithstanding our soliciting him by letter to allow you to remain.*' How to reconcile this with his declaration to me in one of his letters, "You may depend upon it I am not disposed to dis-"tress you, and I would attempt no opposition were it in my "power," is what I am at a loss to explain.

I sincerely wish that you may be preserved from error and unintentional mistakes in your intended publication, that no handle may be given to Mr. H. who will no doubt reply. We ought to beware of casting stumbling-blocks in the way of the world, and while we are valiant for the truth upon the earth, we ought only to contend with the weapons with which God has furnished us. I hope you will interpret my design in troubling you with this long letter, to my desire to lend you what little assistance is in my power. I shall be glad to hear from you when you find time. Mr. ——— joins me with Mrs. O. in best respects to you and Mrs. Ewing.

I am,

My Dear Sir,

Most sincerely and affectionately yours,

WILLIAM ORME.

FINIS.

REMARKS

ON

A LATE PUBLICATION

BY

MR GREVILLE EWING,

ENTITLED, FACTS & DOCUMENTS, &c.

BY

ROBERT HALDANE.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED BY J. RITCHIE.
SOLD BY J. OGLE, AND A. JOHNSTONE, EDINBURGH; J. & A. DUNCAN, AND M. OGLE, GLASGOW; E. LESSLIE, DUNDEE; AND MAXWELL & WILSON, AND WILLIAMS & SMITH, LONDON.

1809.

THE differences which have taken place between Mr Ewing and me, are much to be lamented; and, among many other things, will no doubt be a great cause of stumbling to the world. What will particularly strike every person who hears of them is, that they have so long existed in one shape or another. The justness of the remark in my letters to him is now fully verified. I observed, that 'the first unhappy introduction of jealousy betwixt us, was the unscriptural transaction of 'the bond, so foreign in its whole conception to the nature of the kingdom of Christ, and which, as far as we were concerned in it, removed us entirely off scriptural ground.'

In publishing my Letters, it was not my intention to expose, or to blacken the character of Mr Ewing. My design was to testify my own repentance for a transaction, in which I was convinced I had done wrong; to vindicate my conduct which had been misrepresented; and to make some impression on him, by remonstrating on the impropriety of adhering any longer to what I conceived to be evidently contrary to the laws and nature of the kingdom of Christ. Mr Ewing, in

replying to my Letters, has evaded or misunderstood the principles on which I proceeded, respecting the unscriptural nature of the bond, and the unlawfulness of continuing to act upon what was in itself opposed to the word of God. Turning the whole into a personal attack, he has thought proper to enter into a variety of particulars that did not affect the merits of the question itself, and to bring forward many things that had before been discussed and settled between us.

He commences with the charge, which he afterwards connects with all he has said in his book, that I deceived him as to the original destination of the house; although after much had been formerly written on the subject between us, he waited on me with two friends whom he named, and in their presence that business was fully investigated, when both of them were satisfied that he was wrong. On that occasion he declared, that he was bound to believe what I then advanced, and upon this footing a reconciliation took place. I have often since, however, had cause to feel, that the wound which this unaccountable misunderstanding on his part had made, was far from being healed. In consequence of the jarrings that continued, or were from time to time renewed, originating chiefly in jealousy, at my earnest desire we had a private meeting, some years ago, when we went over almost all the particulars now brought forward in his book. I thought they might afterwards have been allowed to rest; for on that occasion I spoke fully to him of all the unpleasant things I recollected, which had taken place between us, on purpose, as I told him, that they might be for ever done away. I cannot approve of their being again brought into notice. But it is his own doing, and not mine, and therefore the consequences do not rest with me. Of the partial and unfair manner however in

which he has now exhibited them, I have the greatest reason to complain. From this way of adverting to our differences, and so confidently connecting the whole with motives which he cannot be sure are the true ones, and of which I have the testimony of my own conscience before God that they are falsely imputed, the offence arising from the whole is increased tenfold. It is my prayer, that in replying to what he has most unjustly alleged, I may not be permitted to fall into the same evils with regard to him; that in meekness I may be enabled to conduct myself in this matter; and that the Lord may grant him repentance for the sin he has committed.

I never could have read Mr Ewing's book with the composure I felt when I first perused it, if I had not both been conscious that the accusations it contains are false, and also convinced that I could answer it in every particular. Such a tissue of mistated facts and misrepresentations as it exhibits from beginning to end, I never met with. Nor do I recollect having any where seen so awful a violation of our Lord's words, Matt. vii. 1. "Judge not that ye be not judged;" and of the solemn warning of the apostle, 1 Cor. iv. 5. "Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." The book itself I could answer, from one end to the other, as fast as I could speak; the only difficulty arises from its length. For this reason, I think it necessary in the mean time to make some general remarks; for I can easily conceive that those who are strangers to all the circumstances, if they do not immediately condemn, will be at a loss to account, on the common principles of integrity, for conduct so grossly misrepresented, and

so injuriously connected with motives of supposed insincerity and deceit.

Mr Ewing commences his attack in the very first page. He speaks of reports which originated in the unguarded conduct of my former life, which were much exaggerated by resentment at my politics. Here is a statement which is either intended to convey two distinct charges, or which is capable of being so understood. The accusation of unguarded conduct is indeed very general; but the more this is the case, the thrust is the more dangerous, while the difficulty of parrying it is increased. I can only meet it by a general assertion, to which however I could bring Mr Ewing himself as a witness, from a testimonial which he will recollect, that, political opinions apart, which I have formerly explained, the charge is most unfounded and unjust.

But however impossible it may be to fix any stain upon my former conduct, yet, according to him, from the time he and I became acquainted, I conceived a plan of deception to be practised on him, which has been incessantly pursued to the present hour. In order to succeed in this, no trouble or self-denial has been spared, and, at an immense expence, the force of a vast variety of engines has been brought into action against him. Let any sober-minded person deliberately peruse Mr Ewing's book, and he will be led into one of the most surprising scenes; and will be called to witness as astonishing an anomaly in human character, as perhaps is exhibited in the history of ancient or modern times.

The first circumstance he records, may serve as a specimen of all the rest. I had conceived, he says, a plan of a mission to India. I wished co-operation; and if Mr Ewing should think proper to give his consent to

accompany me, with other two associates who were already engaged, I would sell my estate, and devote the price of it to defray the expence, as well as my own life, to assist in the operations of the mission. This is his statement, and I feel deeply for him when I relate what follows, and reflect that any man was capable of harbouring such thoughts as he has expressed. It has been alleged to him, that he was artfully taken by surprise. He doubts if this was not the case. Perhaps however it would be injustice positively to accuse me of artifice in this matter! After reading this, I confess I was prepared for every thing that follows in his book, and should not have been surprised, had he even made things worse than he has done. How can I account for such treatment from any man on earth, unless I suppose, that, giving way to the intemperance of his mind, suspicious jealousy has so far disordered his imagination, as entirely to overpower his judgment in relation to whatever concerns me or my conduct.

The design of going to India failed, nevertheless I sold my estate, and stedfastly pursued my plan respecting Mr Ewing. In order to accomplish it, I purchased, for a large sum, a Tabernacle at Glasgow, and put him in possession of it by a legal instrument. Mr Ewing says, 'The house was vested in me, for the express 'and avowed purpose of rendering me, while I chose to 'occupy it, independent of Mr Haldane.' This deed, however, was drawn up with a design to ensnare!

Proceeding to unfold this progress of deceit that was practised upon him, he brings forward certain letters which he thus introduces: 'The manner in which I 'left the Church of Scotland, and my situation in Lady 'Glenorchy's chapel, will appear from the following

'letters, and will furnish matter of comparison with the 'manner in which I have been compelled to break off 'my intercourse with Mr Haldane, and am now urged 'by him to leave my situation in the Tabernacle of 'Glasgow.' He goes on to give an account of this transaction, and that his readers may be better able to judge of it, he lays before them, not only his correspondence with the trustees of the chapel, but an extract from the minute of presbytery on the subject. According to these 'facts and documents,' nothing could be more pleasing and harmonious. He is 'actuated by 'no feeling of dissatisfaction or resentment against ei-'ther trustees, minister, members of session, or congre-'gation.' But has he forgotten, or does he think others have forgotten, the terms on which he parted with his colleague? Does he not recollect, that rather than join with that congregation in worship, he chose to spend the Lord's day at home *? Is he ignorant of the declaration of his sister, that in consequence of what had taken place with her brother, it was impossible for her to remain in the chapel? He has indeed completed 'the progress of writs,' but he has presented his readers with a partial and distorted view of this subject, as well as of every other contained in his book. Let this serve as a specimen of the whole.

At page 60. Mr Ewing introduces another 'document.' In consequence of his unworthy suspicion that I had deceived him, because I did not settle the house in perpetuity upon the church, he came to Edinburgh, and requested to be allowed to call on me with two friends

* He scrupled not afterwards to communicate with the church of Scotland, although he would not do so with this congregation.

whom he named, for the purpose of fully discussing the subject. As this brings him to a fact of the utmost importance between us, which can still be appealed to, and which sufficiently disproves his very unjust allegations, he has laboured to misrepresent it. He also endeavours to fix on me a letter as written on that occasion by my authority, to which he refers again and again in his book, but the meaning of which, it appears, he does not understand to this hour.

The conversation accordingly took place. But what an account has he given of it? Instead of candidly acknowledging, that after hearing him and me, his friends were both satisfied *that he was in the wrong*, he says: 'Soon after these letters had passed between 'Mr Haldane and me, I went to Edinburgh; and as 'neither by conversation nor correspondence had we 'been able to come to any agreement between ourselves, 'we met for discussing the subject, in the presence of 'two common friends, and another came in towards the 'end of the conversation. We then went over the same 'ground, as we had done in our previous correspond-'ence, and each persisted in his own views. Our bre-'thren naturally deprecated a rupture between us. They 'justly observed, that whatever truth might be in my 'representations respecting Mr Haldane's concealment 'of his intentions from me, yet as all our conversations 'on the subject had been private and confidential, no 'evidence could be produced against him. This I rea-'dily admitted, and was perfectly sensible, that I could 'never make my complaint a subject of church discipline. 'But the difficulty with me was, how could I go on, in 'connexion with a man who had forfeited my confidence. 'They observed to me, that by our agreement I was 'perfectly independent of him; that the church, which

'might be formed, were sure of the house at least as 'long as I was with them; that though I might be dis-'appointed in my hopes of seeing the house permanent-'ly secured to them, yet it would be a very strong 'measure to leave, on that account, so great a sphere of 'usefulness; and, that the triumph which it would give 'to enemies, were it known that any misunderstanding 'had taken place between Mr Haldane and me, should 'lead me to make every sacrifice possible, in order to 'prevent it. On these grounds, I consented to give up 'all further dispute with Mr Haldane, and to form a 'church in Glasgow, provided I obtained the consent 'of my friends there. I also consented to forgive him 'the injury which I thought he had done me.'

Such is Mr Ewing's account, and let any one read it with attention and say, if ever he met with the like. According to it, a more unprincipled compromise never was made. In what a strange light does he exhibit his friends! They observe, that whatever truth might be in his representations respecting Mr H.'s concealment of his intention from him, no evidence of this could be produced. This he admitted, but his difficulty was, how could he go on in connexion with a man who had forfeited his confidence. This difficulty they easily remove. They observe, that by our agreement he is perfectly independent of me; that the church would be sure of the house as long as he was with them, that he had a great sphere of usefulness, and that enemies would triumph if we disagreed. Truly they are represented as honourable counsellors. But if Mr Ewing must disgrace himself and calumniate me, why should he also vilify them?

On these grounds Mr Ewing consents to give up all further dispute with Mr Haldane. He also consents to forgive him the injury which he thought he had

done him. 'A reconciliation,' says he, 'took place accordingly, which was *bona fide* on my part, though the 'opinion I had of the manner in which I had been 'used, was entirely the same.' Astonishing! Mr Ewing is reconciled *bona fide* to a man who had deceived him and forfeited his confidence, who was still persisting in deceit and direct falsehood, and positively contradicting all Mr Ewing's statements. And I am reconciled to a man, who, though unable to prove it, is fully convinced of my insincerity, while I submit to accept of *forgiveness* from him for an injury, which I am enabled to shew, to the satisfaction of both his friends, that I had never committed against him.

Mr Ewing proceeds, p. 60. 'In order to reconcile 'my friends in Glasgow, to the formation of a church, 'without any settlement with Mr Haldane, the gentle-'man, who came in towards the end of the above meet-'ing, proposed to write me a letter explaining what he 'knew to be the situation and views of the church in 'Edinburgh. This proposal was approved by Mr 'Haldane, and the letter was written, by his authority, 'and given to me in the course of a few days.'

The gentleman of whom he so confidently speaks was not present at the meeting.

After Mr Ewing had deliberately written the above account, which is a sufficient specimen of his accuracy and manner of representing others in a book bearing the title of 'facts and documents,' he has made inquiry, he says, at the gentlemen who were present, and his only doubt now relates to the time when the writer of the letter came in. Mr Ewing still thinks he came in at the end of the conversation which was held between him and me in the presence of the two friends; but now he is not sure whether he came in then or in a

conversation at my house in the evening, at which Mr Ewing says he himself was not present, and which he adds *he never heard of before.* 'I never heard of that 'conversation before, but can well believe it may 'have taken place, and am of opinion that it goes far to 'explain the impression which the gentlemen now say, 'was made upon their minds. It is, indeed, stated by 'one of them to have had its own share of influence in 'producing that impression. "After hearing both "parties," he says, "*and having had a further conversa-*"*tion on the subject in the evening,* (*at which Mr Ewing,* "*I think, was not present*) and in which Mr ——— "having come in, took part, the impression made on "all our minds, was, that Mr Ewing had misunder-"stood Mr Haldane, and that Mr Haldane had not "given him reason to expect that he had any inten-"tion of making a gift of the Tabernacle to the "church."

Mr Ewing is eager to make his escape by means of the above sentence, part of it thrown into italics by himself; but it is a vain attempt. Whether the words will bear the interpretation he has put on them, is another question; but the writer declares he was fully convinced at the meeting in the forenoon, at which Mr Ewing was present, that I had not deceived him. He indeed says he was confirmed in the evening, that Mr Ewing was wrong in what he was attempting to obtain; but this is quite distinct from his conviction that Mr Ewing had misunderstood me, and that I had not given him reason to expect what he charged me with. The other friend says that he does not know that he was present at all in the evening.

Mr Ewing goes on and says—'Be this as it may,

'my views of the subject have already been stated, and 'the reader may suspend his judgment, till he shall hear 'what may be said on the other side. The only asser-'tion which I make positively, as to the matter of fact, 'in this affair, is, *that the letter was written with the 'knowledge and consent of Mr Haldane, and contained his 'professed sentiments at that time.*' For this, namely that the letter was written with *my knowledge and consent*, as well as that it contained my professed sentiments, he adds that he can appeal to the gentlemen who were present at our discussion. Well, what do these gentlemen say? They say they do not recollect any thing of the letter, nor of having ever seen it, nor of any offer by the writer of it, nor request by them to write it; and the opinion of the writer of it is, that it was not written by my authority, or even with my knowledge. He was not at the meeting at all, 'but called,' he says, 'accidentally in the evening, and staid a very short 'time.' The only persons present at the meeting were the two gentlemen above alluded to. It was held in my house in the forenoon, and was closed before dinner, during which time no other person was present.

So much for Mr Ewing's assertions, that the letter was written by my authority. Whether I ever saw it I cannot say. It is very probable that I did, and that I approved of it, but I do not recollect it. In itself, it does not serve Mr Ewing's cause, but is quite against him. I sincerely wish it had been acted on. It is very different from the bond, and is free of all its evils. This letter declares, that the church, who are not to have any part of the expence of erecting the house, will have nothing to do with the property of it. This was fair and right, and left every thing free.

But it was for the very reverse of this that Mr Ewing had been so long contending. The bond, in opposition to this letter, divested the proprietor of the right of the house during Mr Ewing's incumbency; and without giving up the peculiar right he had acquired, Mr Ewing wanted to extend it afterwards in perpetuity to the church, which was not then in existence. According to the letter, while the church and the proprietor were agreed, they would go on together; and no longer was either of the parties bound. This is clearly the meaning of the letter; and the writer of it, both at that time and ever since, has condemned the bond as a most unscriptural and improper transaction. The letter further says, 'The collections given at the doors by the 'audience or the church are applied solely in defraying 'the expence of the house. We take no concern with them 'whatsoever.' If Mr Ewing will have this letter to be a commentary on his bond, although in fact it explodes it altogether, let the above sentence, in which it does coincide with the bond, corroborate what I said to him of his support being wholly derived from the promiscuous multitude, and not from the church. Here Mr Ewing's salary comes under the article of 'the expence of the house,' in which the church is *to take no concern whatsoever!* Between his authorised commentary and his acknowledged text, Mr Ewing here stands on very aukward ground. But he is not the first who has found himself in this predicament. It will always happen, when, in order to secure the co-operation, or to regulate the fellowship of the saints, additions are made to the word of God, whether they happen to be confessions of faith, church covenants and regulations, or stamped bonds.

Such was the letter which not only condemned all

that Mr Ewing had been so long insisting to obtain, but also his very unscriptural conduct, and that of his friends in Glasgow, in refusing during that period to *form* a church.

The internal evidence against Mr Ewing's statement of the above conversation is complete. And here a striking consideration presents itself. In the whole of his narrative, where witnesses are not present, he rolls on like a sweeping flood. Nothing for a moment stops his course. Assertions, suspicions, and the most daring invasion of the prerogative of the Searcher of hearts, successively present themselves. But when he comes into the presence of witnesses, suddenly his career is arrested. He flounders as in a quagmire. He is perplexed, embarrassed, he faulters and contradicts himself; and at length, by a desperate effort to get free, overturns and wounds both himself and his friends. He then stops and vaunts, that he has justified himself, but the contrary is proved by the testimony which he himself has adduced.

It is wonderful that Mr Ewing could have sat down deliberately to write such an account; but this was a part in 'the progress of his writs,' which it was absolutely necessary to fill up. Thinking that he has explained the matter, the reader will observe the use he all along makes of this supposed deception, from the concealment, as he says, of my sentiments, that was put upon him. He appeals to it throughout his book, connects it with the whole, thus distorting and discolouring every document, and every fact, and at length places it at the head of all the charges which he has summed up in the end of his book. Conscious as I am, that these are false, and seeing that, from the very nature of many of them, they could only be known to the Searcher of

hearts; what shall I say of his preferring them in the manner he has done? There is something here at stake between us, when he deliberately accuses, and I deliberately deny, bearing an importance far beyond our characters in the sight of man, or any thing within the bounds of time.

In addition to the accusation of attempting to deceive him, he brings against me the charge of COVETOUSNESS. This he lays as the foundation of all his charges; for while the deception in regard to the destination of the house can be traced to no other root, he thinks I became hostile to him, because he would not be my agent for recovering the money I had laid out on the Tabernacle. How was it possible for him to advance such a statement? Does he not blush when he recollects what I was then beginning to lay out, and what he has access to know I have since laid out, without the prospect of remuneration? If my object was to recover the money I paid for the Glasgow Tabernacle, why had I just before laid it out? or if I had suddenly changed my mind, why did I go on to lay out so much in other places? If indeed the house had then been put on the footing I proposed, (the idea of which probably originated from Mr Ewing's writing me to give up entirely my right to it, which also appears to be the fact from the letters he has published, although as to this I do not recollect), the church would have stood on ground no less honourable; because it was doing something towards its own accommodation. To me however it made little or no difference. I believe it will be admitted, that I have laid out as much money in support of the work I was engaged in, as was consistent with my duty. I can also affirm, that nothing in this country with which I was connected, and which I

thought was for the advancement of the gospel, has stood still for want of money. Even if the church at Glasgow had immediately refunded all that I paid for the house, what would that have been to the sum I have since laid out on similar objects? What a poor business it is for him to remind me of the assistance I have got from the surplus of his house! Deducting the insurances, it does not in all much exceed L. 300. This was to go to assist in supporting the classes, and it would not have paid the expence of some single years of the tutor's fees. He probably knows, however, that it never reached the class, but went to make up a deficiency elsewhere. 'Money,' says Mr Ewing, 'would have satisfied him.' What must be the state of that man's mind, who, knowing all that he does, could deliberately make this assertion?

He represents me as aiming at dominion over the churches, and acting among them as a pope. That the plan of proceeding by worldly means, such as his bond discovers, naturally tended to create improper influence, I admit. But this is one of the things that points out to me the evil which entwined itself from the foundation with the system we were endeavouring to rear; and, owing to this, I now condemn much of what has been done. Partiality to what I had so great a share in, has not so far blinded my mind, as to induce me to regret the overthrow of whatever I am convinced was wrong. Mr Ewing can now tell the world, that I settled on him the choice of his assistant; yet amidst his zeal against patronage, he would still defend that settlement and his bond. He can tell us, that afterwards he left it to me to 'appoint' one for him; and still there is no fault found. But now, when I refuse any longer to countenance a plan which involves such unscriptural pro-

ceedings, and arrangements which, in the case of Mr Wardlaw, he could coolly plead as not allowing his having a co-pastor; when I remonstrate with him on his adherence to it, he is filled with the utmost indignation, and to blacken me he sticks at nothing. But how does it agree with his representation of my love of influence, that the line of conduct I now pursue tends to do it completely away? He speaks of my retaining as my property the Tabernacle at Edinburgh, as similar to the system of the bond, by which he and I so far settled the plan of the church at Glasgow. But has he not discernment sufficient to perceive the difference between a church such as his, so dependent by its constitution on the services of one man, and on the aid of the world; and another which is conformed to the apostolic model, which does not subsist by the individual exertions of any man; in which all the brethren obey the command of exhorting one another, and edifying themselves in love, and which, standing on the footing on which Jesus has placed his churches in his spiritual kingdom, is perfectly independent, and which neither asks nor receives any aid from the world? Were the house to be sold to-morrow, or blown in the air, it would not prevent them one Lord's day from observing all the ordinances. They would assemble in such numbers as they had convenience for meeting together. They would not suspend their fellowship one hour, although they should not have command of money to purchase a house.

In attempting to expose me by the publication of my private letters, Mr Ewing has only exposed himself. Where is there a single sentence to be found in them that shews any thing like insincerity or deceit? Marks of ignorance, of some subjects, may indeed be pointed

out, which I have already confessed, and which I now renounce, although Mr Ewing still adheres to the same system. Every where through the whole of these letters, a uniform desire, if I mistake not, appears, to pay attention to the work in which we were engaged, and to promote its success. Two things besides, may be observed. The first is, that I invariably adhere in them to what I had originally asserted respecting the original destination of the house. The next is, that they are written in a conciliatory manner. But the bare publication of these letters, in which I see nothing to make me ashamed, Mr Ewing was sensible would not answer his design. He therefore not only subjoins his replies, (one of the longest of which, now brought forward as an authentic document, I never saw), but adds a long commentary in notes, written at the present time. In these notes he criticises and wrests * even particular words. He has shewn by these letters, that I made a proposal, which has already been noticed, that the church at Glasgow should endeavour to redeem the house in a given time, while I offered a large sum to assist in this object; or that, if they would not agree to this, I would keep the house on the footing which the bond distinctly specified, leaving it in my own power after his incumbency. Whatever objections Mr Ewing formerly had to this arrangement, it appears he has now changed his mind. We hear of no remonstrances against those with whom he acts at present, who retain their houses completely in their own power. He has shewn, that having made a demand from me, in an improper manner, for an ar-

* See a remarkable instance of this in the three first lines of his note on the word 'almost,' page 53. Read the sentence that follows it, and the paragraph at the top of page 54. with its note, and see that note contradicted in another note, page 32.

ticle which it by no means fell to my part to pay, I first refused it, but after stating my reasons for doing so, I yielded to him for the sake of peace. And lastly, he has brought this circumstance to light, that I gave him L. 200 a-year for teaching the class, for more than three years, so that, with some deduction for books, he was receiving L. 400 a-year: that I did this at first out of kindness to him, and in order to assist him; but afterwards wished him to go on with his work for L. 300 per annum, as I did not think that, consistently with the great extension of our system, which was so fast taking place, and of course of my expenditure, more than this was proportionable or right; and also because I thought it was a sufficient remuneration to him, as with very few exceptions indeed, it was a much larger salary than any minister in the established church enjoyed; and precisely double what he received while he belonged to it. If I urged him too much to continue to teach the class on these terms, which is the only fault he can justly point out in the business, it arose from a desire to forward the common cause, and because the situation in the Tabernacle, in which I had placed him at such an expence, seemed to give a claim on his exertions if duly recompensed.

To fix suspicion on me, respecting the motives of my conduct from first to last, is the great object he has in view in the publication of my private letters, and through the whole of his book. But if suspicion must be excited, if I must be held up a second time among the number of 'artful and designing men *,' a public charge in which he was formerly included, and from which he was so strenuous that I should publicly vindicate myself, to which of us, after all, is suspicion

* See Pastoral Admonition.

most likely to attach? Is it to me, who sold my estate, and offered, as he says, to devote the price of it, and my own life, to a mission to India, if he would go with me; *when it was stipulated that a sum of money, which would have rendered him independent, was immediately to be put in his hand* *—who purchased and fitted up, at the rate of nearly L. 3000, a house for him to preach in, and put it in his power by a legal instrument? A little before the bond was extended, he requested it might not be delayed, saying, that his friends were uneasy because it was not settled, as till then, they observed, he had no proper *security*. When it was settled, or soon after, he consulted a man of business (which is contrary to what he has asserted in his book †), who assured him that it was properly executed. From this settlement, and the class, he derived the salary that has been mentioned above. Did it look like a plan of deceit on my part, that while there were differences between us, I wrote to him many letters, and neither kept copies of them, nor preserved his answers; while his conduct in this respect was precisely the reverse? To the behaviour of which of us does suspicion most naturally attach, when we proceeded amicably and cordially, as he tells us, (page 29. and see the date of the bond, page 21.) till the *very period*, when, by his own account, I made him independent of me? Immediately afterwards, according to him, it was far otherwise. At

* Mr Ewing, in speaking of India, has passed over in silence this important 'fact,' and has, as usual, told only part of the truth. Perhaps he also omitted to inform his friends of this, who, he says, suspect I designed to ensnare him.

† Pag. 172.---Mr Ewing was neither so simple nor so young a man at that period, as he would lead us from his book to suppose.

the time too of giving him the bond, he expressed himself fully satisfied, that it was according to the promise which from the first I had made to him; but soon after he charged me with not having fixed that the house should be entirely alienated from me, and made over in perpetuity to the church which should afterwards assemble in it. And while he was for a long time urging me to this, the propriety of divesting himself of the exclusive right to the house conferred on him by the bond, did not occur to him, or was not proposed by him, which, on the same principle, ought to have been done.

It is not, however, my design to render evil for evil, or railing for railing. I did not suspect that his motives were corrupt in these transactions. If I had entertained such an opinion I would not have continued to act with him. But on the other hand I affirm, that such having been the existing circumstances between us, it very ill becomes him to introduce the subject of suspicion. In this instance, as he said to Mr Brown in his Exposure, he has 'suggested an idea which 'can only injure himself. A suspicious man is justly 'to be suspected. "Suspicion," says Dr Johnson, "is "not less an enemy to virtue than to happiness; he "that is already corrupt is naturally suspicious, and he "that becomes suspicious will quickly be corrupt." 'Much as I disapprove of such an insinuation,—yet 'since it is made, I am surely entitled to ask, to which 'of the two is it most likely to apply * ?'

When speaking of our differences, he makes a reference to temper. I believe there is no one acquainted with Mr Ewing who would not have expected him to be silent on this topic. I was fully warned, indeed, on this subject, before he left the established

* Exposure, page 7.

church; but I laid more stress on the force of the general principles which I believed he possessed, than I afterwards found, to my cost, I ought to have done.

I shall now notice Mr Ewing's want of candour in contrasting my words in my early and last letters, respecting the tenor by which he holds the house. When writing the former, I believed it to be a transaction lawful in the sight of God, and as he had done nothing which on the principles of common honesty required that he should renounce it*, I considered that it could not be set aside without the consent of both parties. From Mr Ewing's answers to what I have said on the subject of the bond, he appears either not to understand the grounds on which I have rested the whole, or he has purposely evaded what has been urged. I founded the claim on the principles of the gospel, and on them I have proved that the bond is antichristian. Mr Ewing objects to my saying, that the obligation was a transaction between us solely of a religious nature; 'the reverse of 'this,' he says, 'is precisely the fact. The obligation 'referred to in his letters was a transaction of a mixed 'nature.' This is a mere sophism. Every one knows that the building was a temporal concern, and that this building was made over by the bond on certain conditions to Mr Ewing. But what was the object of the contract? Was it not purely religious? It indeed secured to Mr Ewing a certain salary; but for what end? Solely that he might preach the gospel and dispense ordinances. He speaks of the obligation being reciprocal. What was I then to obtain? By his own account I have got L. 380 in ten years, instead of the interest of nearly L. 3000. At least the Tabernacle has not been

* See my Letters, p. 63.

a gaining concern to me, nor did I ever expect it should. I had one object, and this was '*solely* religious.' I now see 'the rottenness of the whole system.' I profess my sorrow for being engaged in such a transaction, and I have called on Mr Ewing, on Christian principles, to renounce it. I have not disputed the legal validity of the bond, nor consulted counsel to know if I could set it aside. Our co-operation was for religious purposes only, and when I saw that this was secured and perpetuated in a way that is unlawful, I stated to Mr Ewing the reasons which convinced me it should cease, and remonstrated with him against its continuance.

Mr Ewing, however, has advanced some arguments to prove that the deed is not unlawful on Christian principles. To justify his binding himself to preach and to dispense ordinances in the house in a stamped bond and under a penalty, he quotes Ruth iv. 8. and Jeremiah xxxii. 9,—12. which both refer to transactions of a nature purely civil. To condemn my conduct he instances the league with Gibeon, Joshua ix. 14, 15. But the cases are quite dissimilar. On this passage it is justly observed by Mr Scott, 'It does not appear that it would have been wrong to have received the submission of any of the Canaanites who voluntarily should have craved mercy, professed repentance, and renounced idolatry: and therefore the league with Gibeon was valid, though fraudulently sought for, and impolitically entered into.' But he says, my perverted application of his doctrine on vows would make void, through its subtilty, the very ordinance of marriage, which our Lord has so beautifully restored to its original obligation; and then he supposes that one might plead, on the principles I have advanced, for the dissolution of the marriage contract, either with an unbeliever or with a Christian. This directs to a decisive confirmation of

my reasoning, in regard to the unlawfulness of his retaining the bond. The contract of marriage is the most solemn obligation that can exist between two human beings, as Mr Ewing expresses it, 'the most sacred bonds 'of civil society.' Yet in Ezra ix. I read that multitudes were commanded to break this solemn contract, which was actually done, chap. x. 11, 12. Other sorts of engagements I see broken on the very same principle, Nehemiah v. Hence, in the way of ascertaining duty, I learn to resolve every thing into the will of God, and on this ground I rest what I have said respecting the bond.

Mr Ewing makes the supposition, p. 154. that a rich brother might settle a house on a baptist or independent church, in a way that would put it out of his own power and that of his heirs; and let us 'throw all the *condi-* '*tions*,' says he, 'about which we are agreed into the form 'of a regular and legal contract.' Why then after this should we any longer find fault with a confession of faith; and why not continue to preach 'doctrines, modified by feelings of previous stipulation?' and why write papers about vows to explode such practices?

At length, however, the *supposition* extends to the apostle Paul, and Mr Ewing sees nothing in Scripture that would prevent him from believing that Paul when he "separated the disciples at Corinth, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus," would have accepted on such conditions a tack of the house to meet in. Does Mr Ewing indeed, see nothing in Scripture to prevent him from believing this? Paul, according to the laws which he was honoured to promulgate, and the nature of that kingdom on one of the thrones of which he is seated, would instantly have rejected such an offer. He would have called his ignorant brother to repentance; and informed him, that 'in a religious con-

'nection or co-operation, every thing ought to be free 'from first to last;' that while he chose to give his house for the purpose of meeting in, and while they continued to act together as brethren, he would be happy to use the house, and would fully acknowledge the benefit, but any thing further it was not in the nature of Christianity to admit. In what a ridiculous light does Mr Ewing here place the apostle Paul, as entering into an engagement like his bond, for the school of Tyrannus! Binding and obliging himself to preach the gospel and dispense ordinances under a penalty, and *besides performance*; fixing arrangements for 'the maintenance of himself and family,' and engaging to levy and collect seat-rents by himself and others, and also the '*offerings*' at the door from all who chose to attend, and then stipulating for an 'assistant minister,' *to be chosen by himself*. Is this the apostle Paul, who knew no bond in his religious services but the constraining love of Christ? — no other principle to unite or to keep together the disciples, and secure their co-operation? who, when that was gone, considered that all was gone, and while that remained knew that nothing else was needed? Is this Paul stipulating to hold fellowship with the world in a religious ordinance by receiving their money? Paul, who was so delicate in taking assistance even from the saints? He who could appeal to the elders of the church at Ephesus, that although he had resided among them three years, and had not ceased to warn them night and day with tears, and to teach them from house to house, yet his own hands had ministered to his necessity, and to them that were with him? Is this Paul, who had nothing to do to judge them that were without; who never, as it appears, dropped a hint that unbelievers should join in any ordinance in the fellowship of the gospel;

and who never gives us the smallest reason to suppose that he would have soothed the mind or lulled the conscience of any man in a state of disobedience and alienation from God, by allowing him for a moment to suppose that he was contributing to the *support of the gospel*.

But why may not Mr Ewing, on the same principles, be allowed to carry his suppositions further? *Suppose* then that Paul had accepted the bond, and entered, in virtue of it, into the possession of the school of Tyrannus. But some of his friends suggest to him, that they cannot think of forming a church, unless the school shall be given them in perpetuity. This prevents the disciples from observing the ordinances for a twelvemonth; during which time Paul and Tyrannus are engaged in discussions and explanations. At length, however, Paul forms a church, and goes on for several years, still acting with his brother from whom he had received the bond, continuing to hold fellowship with him in the gospel, urging him to preach, and having such confidence in him, that he would not assist any neighbouring church till he had given his sanction. After some time, this brother, and many more, think they discover that they have much yet to learn on subjects on account of which they had formerly separated from others, and that the principles they had adopted, though not fully comprehended at first, clearly infer the observance of some things not before attended to, and the duty of relinquishing part of their present practices. They publish their sentiments, fairly stating them for the consideration of the churches. Paul writes a book in answer, containing many personalities, in which he speaks 'at them, and not to them,' and wherein, without naming them, he severely reproves certain of the churches to which he had constant access, and to

which he had never, in addressing them, given a hint of the subjects on which he now animadverts. His brother, more and more confirmed in his sentiments, and still believing that he sees further into the evils of their former system than he had hitherto done, and particularly dissatisfied with some parts of Paul's conduct, in which he thinks he had personally trespassed against him, desires to speak with him alone, according to the rule of Scripture applicable to such cases. This Paul positively refuses. His brother then tells him he is convinced that the bond by which the house he occupies for worship is vested in his person, is repugnant to the principles of that gospel which he preaches, and that it is his duty to renounce it. Paul receives the notice with the highest indignation, brands him as one who, for saying so, is guilty of the grossest immorality, and, regardless of the doctrine enjoined on the believers at Corinth respecting their differences, hastens to Rome to consult a lawyer whether he can retain the house by force. His brother remonstrates with him by letters on the impropriety of his conduct, and, deprecating the application of legal principles, insists that the question ought to be determined on those of equity and of the gospel. As no answer is returned, and distorted accounts of the whole are circulated, he at length publishes his letters. Paul immediately writes a libel against him—publishes his private letters, which for ten years he had carefully treasured up—declares that he is now convinced he overreached him from the beginning, and that he has been all along practising upon him a system of deceit—represents himself as persecuted, and finally, throws up his office in the church.—Should some authentic document, till now unheard of, convey to us the narrative of this anomalous portion of the apostle's his-

tory, proving indeed that it was 'no overcharged ima-'ginary picture, but taken from what was known to be 'done,' how great would be our astonishment and perplexity! Truth may thus be exhibited by the transference, may be illustrated by so striking a contrast as is here obtruded on the mind. But let not even the possibility of such conduct be imputed to the apostle Paul. Let no such unworthy suppositions attach for one moment to the character of this distinguished servant, this delegated ambassador of Jesus Christ.

In defence of that most serious violation of the Christian law relating to the bond, in the provision it makes for his support as pastor of the church by the contributions of the promiscuous multitude, how feeble an attempt has Mr Ewing made to justify the practice! Here is an irremediable flaw in the bond, come of it what may. And surely, if something better is not advanced from Scripture, than Mr Ewing has done to defend taking collections from the world, the practice will soon be universally given up by the churches of Christ. In order to support it, he asks the question, if preachers of the gospel must in no case receive any thing except from the members of a church, why did Paul, and some brethren who accompanied him, accept the hospitality and bounty of so many at Melita? But was it ever supposed to be unlawful for a Christian to accept the rights of common hospitality from any man? Is not this totally different from holding religious fellowship in an ordinance of Christ; or from drawing the regular supply which is given to the pastor, from a mixed assembly, and not exclusively from a church?

Mr Ewing endeavours to free himself from the charge of having receded from his former opinions, and from the principles on the profession of which he received

the occupancy of the house. In this he has completely failed. At present, however, I shall only call the reader's attention to two circumstances, which are indeed decisive on the subject. The first, to which I adverted before, (Letters, p. 62.) which he has not set aside, and which all the art of man will never set aside, is the confession he has publicly and voluntarily made, of the justness of Mr Robertson's conclusion respecting the inevitable termination of the system on which we at first proceeded. The second is, that I now call on him to point out one single article in which I have receded; while I can point out several changes in him, and shew how he has fluctuated in his sentiments, first going forward and then backward. It was while in his state of progress that I became acquainted with him, and gave him the house, and now we find him in a retrograde course. This is strictly the fact, according to his own writings, and the testimony of many witnesses, however he may now attempt to gloss it over.

He has endeavoured to set aside the fact, that he had *fully decided* the present question between us about the house, in the case of Mr Bogue. But it is a vain attempt. It was he that induced me to take that step. Every thing was then settled in the business with Mr Bogue; and notwithstanding what he now asserts, he knew that this was the case, and was acquainted with the discussion it occasioned, for I shewed him my answer to Mr Bogue; and neither then nor afterwards did he find fault with my conduct, but undertook immediately the teaching of the class. The story about Mr Garie, as I shall afterwards shew, is nothing to his purpose.

He has made an ineffectual attempt to shake himself free from his own reasoning upon vows, so applicable to his present situation. But he was at that time en-

gaged in an attack upon others, and a vindication of himself. Now that the case is reversed, the reasoning must be explained away.

Mr Ewing has not been able to assign any satisfactory reason for not meeting me alone as I desired. Of all that he has said on the subject, however, the best excuse for him is, that he does not, as now appears, understand the meaning of the passage, Matt. xviii. 15. This is evident from the distinction with which he tries to get off, page 105, between public and private offences. He says that I am perfectly familiar with the distinction between private and public offences, and he never heard that I denied its propriety. No man surely could deny the distinction; but what has this to do with the above text? 'The rule of procedure in Matt. xviii. 15,---17,' says he, 'to which he alluded, did not apply; for there 'was no private offence between us.' Indeed! Does the text then make such a distinction? In what gloss or commentary has Mr Ewing learned this? It speaks as is evident of personal offences, but says nothing of privacy or publicity. If my brother trespass against me in any circumstances, or any manner whatever, the remedy pointed out is that, in the first instance, I go to him alone. This fancied restriction respecting publicity, is one of those traditions by which it seems Mr Ewing, in the present case, has made void this part of Scripture. I am thankful I did not yield to his wish to meet with him, in the first instance, in the presence of others, which, in the way he proposed, was not even the second step. Having forsaken scriptural ground, I should then have felt myself so far responsible for the evil that has followed; but now, as I observed to him before, I rest in the consciousness of having done on this point what duty requires.

He triumphs greatly on account of the two chasms in

my printed letters. I can only say, that it was to spare him, not myself, that I left out the paragraph about my conversations with the preachers, and his mode of conducting such business. I feel no reason either to be ashamed of, or to regret these meetings with the students. I shall insert at the end, the paper to which he refers, that was given to them to read. He had no ground to assert, as he has done in the face of truth and evidence, that there was any thing clandestine in the business, or that even the smallest concealment was attempted.

I also notice the other chasm, as to the insufficiency of the walls of the house, which I thought it better not to bring before the public, but to which, now since he has chosen to do it, I have no objection. Of this too he has given a most distorted account. He says that he has known me stand at the very gable of which I speak in the above passage, and desire him to observe how exactly it continued on the perpendicular, and that I often remarked, that such a wall twenty years old was far more secure than a new wall—how excellent the roof was—and how well supported the galleries, even independent of the walls. The truth is this; the roof was always reckoned excellent, but the walls were slight. The reasons however which I gave to Mr Ewing to satisfy him of the sufficiency of the house, had convinced me both at the time of the purchase and afterwards. But about three years ago, Mr Harley, greatly alarmed, wrote to me that the front wall had rent. I immediately sent from Edinburgh a man of skill and character to inspect it, and he gave me the report which is contained in the letter. I ask Mr Ewing, if, ever since that time, I stood at the gable, and spoke to him of the sufficiency of the walls? He will recollect that I did not; and the connexion in which he has placed

these facts, should put the most unwary of his readers on their guard. The discovery after several years, of the rent in the wall of the house, in spite of the improbable conjecture, that although so often narrowly inspected it was not new, was a sufficient reason for writing to him on the business, in consequence of the idea which he had held out of purchasing the house, to continue permanently a place of worship. He will also remember, that it is nearly two years, since, standing by the wall, I mentioned the fact to himself. If I did not state every thing so particularly as in my letter, Mr Harley, who was standing close by us, will be at no loss to explain the reason.

After introducing the letter about the insufficiency of the foundation of the props of the galleries, he says, it remains with me to account to the public for the manner in which I fitted up the house. This is one of the many instances of that unfairness in him, of which he complained so bitterly in the case of Mr Robertson. 'It is truly 'hard,' says he, 'that from a clerical opponent one should 'so seldom meet with fair play. I have never yet seen 'an ecclesiastic make war upon those who questioned 'the claims of his hierarchy, without desiderating in 'his conduct the plain dealing of an honest man *.' He well remembers, that no pains or expence was spared by me, to put every thing in the most secure and perfect state; and that the whole work was carried forward and completed under the inspection of Mr Harley. He is amused how confidently I state my plan in the paragraph which I omitted in publishing my Letters, for their procedure in reducing the length of the house. But this was not only applicable to the failure of the wall, but furnished an answer, in case after all they had chosen to purchase it, to one of the ob-

* Animadversions, p. 72.

jections in Mr Harley's letter about the size of the house.

Mr Ewing thinks, that 'the most disgraceful thing' in my letter to Mr Harley, Sept. 22, is, that I was willing to take the price of the house as hush-money. This is in direct contradiction to another remark so often made, that I intended all along to publish my letters. But whichever view he takes of the subject, he does not hesitate a moment to impute bad motives.

He finds fault because I inform him, in the last of the letters, of the manner in which I intend to apply the price of the house, if he give it up, and thinks it is sounding a trumpet before me. But he will recollect, that this annunciation was necessary, as it gives a complete answer to one of the strongest objections in Mr Harley's letter to his giving up the house. He there says, that it is Mr Ewing's duty to retain the house, the more so as the relinquishing of it might be injurious to the spread of the gospel; for were it now at my disposal, it is thought it would soon be turned to another purpose. In his reflections on this proposal, Mr Ewing observes, that it has been seen, 'that money, and mo-'ney alone, would have satisfied Mr Haldane;' and in the next sentence he says, 'whether his object be re-'imbursement or not, I pretend not to judge.' What a business it is to reply to a book like this, in which contradictions and misrepresentations abound in every page!

I shall subjoin Mr Harley's letter, written, as it now appears, by Mr Ewing's direction, and my answers. It was not on my own account that they were formerly withheld. Mr Ewing seems well aware, that to make them in any way subservient to his purpose, they stood in need, like the other letters, of a very laboured commentary. Let them now speak for themselves.

When I ask, in my answer to Mr Harley, if Mr Ewing is to be viewed as an object of compassion in the business, he observes in his note, that Mr Harley's words did not call for so mean and insulting a question. But it may be easily seen, that in various parts of his work, Mr Ewing endeavours to hold himself up as one who is persecuted. I may still answer his lamentations about leaving a very wide sphere of usefulness, in the very words of my letter to Mr Harley,—' Are you and your friends so entirely destitute of what is necessary for the support of yourselves and your system, to render it impossible, or do you only want the inclination?' A numerous church, with extensive connexions, and yet a hardship *to provide for themselves!*

From what has already been said, the reader may judge of the manner in which Mr Ewing has conducted his defence. To draw off attention from the question in hand, or to give a false colour to his reasonings on the subject, he has enlarged the field of controversy, not in the way that would lead to the investigation of principles at issue between us, but, on the contrary, he has made the whole as personal as possible. The temptation, however, to which this has exposed him, has proved too great, and it is evident, from the spirit he manifests, that he has fallen before it. He derives some apparent advantage from the long indulgence of suspicion and jealousy, opposed as it was to a candid desire on my part to do him all justice, and to conciliate him by every means, which I endeavoured to do to the last, as is seen in my printed Letters. Even this he turns into a ground of accusation: and here I must say, that he has sufficiently put it out of my power to retort; for not one conciliatory expression — not one breath of Christian love, is heard through the whole

of his long book. How unlike is this to the meekness and gentleness of Christ!

He has been treasuring up papers against me, while I neither retained any letters of his, nor copies of my own. He now brings forward these letters in a way calculated to mislead his readers. He has misrepresented facts, and exhibited truth in so partial a manner, as to change its very nature; but the irritation of his mind has blinded his judgment, and led him into such palpable contradictions, such extravagant assertions and evil surmisings, as must, with every attentive and candid reader, completely invalidate his 'facts and documents.' In the mode which he has adopted, the charge of insincerity might be urged against any man on earth. In a similar way, a celebrated infidel of ancient times endeavoured, from a passage of John's gospel, vii. 8, by sinking a word, to fix it on the character of Jesus himself.

Mr Ewing's attempts to impugn my sincerity and integrity can only hurt himself. With all the advantages of long acquaintance, and the most confidential communication of my sentiments, I challenge him to produce one instance in which he can fasten guilt upon me. I recollect that my heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, and my language before God continually must be, Lord enter not into judgment with me. But when I am called to answer to man, on the score of integrity, I am bold to reply with Paul, I have lived in all good conscience to this day. I have been engaged in a multitude of important pecuniary and other transactions, and where is the man that can affirm, I owe him any thing? Amidst many calumnies, the whisper of suspicion on this head has not, that I know of, been heard. Mr Ewing, in his endeavours to assail me in this quarter, has entirely failed, and has not been

able to produce, from the beginning to the end of his book, a single fact that can answer his design. Although he declares at last that he has told all, he hints elsewhere that he could say more, and also that he is still in possession of several of my letters. Of these I recollect nothing, but that they were all written in sincerity of heart, and according to the views I held at the time. I call on him to come forward with the whole, if they will serve his purpose, and to repeat every word which I have whispered in his ear. When he dares to throw a slur on my integrity, I set him at defiance.

He also intimates, that he could produce facts respecting the oppression of the preachers, from which he abstains, lest the individuals should be exposed to the effects of my resentment. How dishonourable such a mode of procedure is, needs not to be pointed out. It is calculated to excite universal suspicion. I call on him to declare the circumstances to which he alludes. After such insinuations, with a view to blacken the character of any man, the excuse which he pleads can never be sustained. The charges he could exhibit, it would not be in his power to bring home to me. Like numberless other misrepresentations in his book, they would, when thoroughly investigated, recoil upon himself.

The contradictions in Mr Ewing's book, sufficiently prove the badness of his cause. Of this we have an instance, page 98. He says he told me, 'with 'all the solemnity and seriousness in his power, 'that he conceived I was now doing as much a-'gainst the success of the gospel, as ever I had 'been honoured to do for it.' Here is the man who had, in Mr Ewing's opinion, acted so deceitfully from the beginning. This declaration was made only two years ago, and Mr Ewing has alleged nothing against

my character since that time, but demanding the Tabernacle. 'Such was our confidence in Mr Haldane,' says he, page 63. referring to all the time prior to the above period, 'that at his own suggestion, we declined assisting to build any house, the rights of which he did 'not certify to have been written or revised by a man 'of business.'

Mr Ewing once esteemed the man who has been guilty of all the charges he has now brought against him, an eminent Christian. What shall he now think of him. Surely he may exclaim, in the words of the apostle, "Some mens sins are open before hand, going before to judgment."—But no; 'I have long,' says he, 'been truly at a loss what to think.' After all, his character, it appears, is a riddle. But if he was formerly at a loss, the late unprincipled attempt to set aside a solemn contract must of course decide the matter; the case can be no longer doubtful. Yet even his late behaviour only '*seems* utterly irreconcileable 'with the most obvious principles of Christianity.' Mr Ewing's conduct is completely the reverse of that enjoined in the word of God. There we are cautioned against ascribing improper motives to one another, while we are taught not to hesitate in condemning those who are guilty of gross sin. We are commanded to judge of false teachers by their fruits, Matt. vii. 20. When we see men indulging in the works of the flesh, we have the example of an apostle for saying, that they shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Their professing to know God is nothing to us, if in works they deny him, Titus i. 16. But Mr Ewing, while in the most unwarranted manner he has ascribed to me motives of action which can only be known to the Searcher of hearts, while he has represented me as a "truce-breaker" in regard to the house, as setting aside all

moral obligation, and proceeding for years in deliberate wickedness, 'knows not what to think.' All this only seems to be irreconcileable to Christian principles. He is very bold when acting in direct opposition to the commandments of Christ. He can judge, without the fear of being judged. But when, supposing his facts and documents to be just, he would be warranted, nay bound, to draw the inevitable conclusion from his own premises, his tongue faulters, he is at a loss, and after all he dare not ascribe such aggravated wickedness to hypocrisy. Surely this resembles the conduct of those who strained out a gnat, and swallowed a camel. No wonder that he looks for an answer. No wonder that he repeatedly discovers his uneasiness in the prospect of it; that he cautions his readers to expect that it will be 'very plausible;' that he feels himself at present 'in a critical situation;' that his 'conduct may 'become the subject of animadversion;' and that he concludes with appealing from the judgment of men, although certainly his book was intended only for them.

In publishing my letters to Mr Ewing, I gave a pledge of my integrity in all our transactions. From my previous knowledge of his character, and especially after the manner in which he had treated me, I could expect no favour at his hands. Common sense would have prevented any man who had been guilty of deceit, from provoking a discussion which could only issue in his own disgrace. Mr Ewing had told me he had copies of my letters, which, had I acted as he has affirmed, would have been sufficient documents of my duplicity. But amidst many defects, having the testimony of my conscience, that I had acted with simplicity and godly sincerity, I was not disposed to shrink from a controversy which I was aware he would conduct with his usual asperity.

He has represented me as acting in the most deceitful manner. The great object of every page of his performance, is to fix this charge upon me. He has written nearly 300 pages of 'facts and documents' to establish his charge, and yet he has unwarily admitted, that he does not himself believe it. It really confounds him, p. 251. to observe the infatuation with which I ascribe disgrace when I meet with it, from whatever cause or quarter, to my faithfulness as a disciple in bearing the cross of his Lord. The man who could act the part which Mr Ewing endeavours to fix on me, must indeed have been infatuated if he thought he was suffering for the gospel. No, he might endeavour to persuade others that he thought so, but unless he were actually deranged he could not suppose that when his malice and deceit were detected, he was suffering for the gospel of Christ. This is an instance of the difficulty of consistently supporting any thing but truth. Mr Ewing's words are a testimony borne by himself to the uprightness of the character he endeavours to blacken; an admission that however mistaken he supposes I have been, I have acted from principle, else I never could place whatever I may suffer to the cause of religion. His feelings are sufficiently strong, and he has on this occasion wrought them up to a very high pitch; but he has not, it appears, so far imposed on himself as to be satisfied of the truth of his charges.

His task, he says, has been unpleasant. I believe it. It could not be otherwise. I would not exchange my present feelings under all the load of calumny he has thrown on me, for his, when he wrote the most cutting and best turned sentence in his book. Still less do I envy him, his sensations, when the hurry of composition is over, when the fever of irritation has subsided, when the congratulations of his friends have ceased, and

when he looks back on his performance with that composure which time will produce. I hope to see the period when he will truly feel for his conduct in this matter. It is my prayer to God that he may give him repentance for prostituting his talents in the cause of defamation and slander.

One great error indeed I committed, and this is at the root of all that has happened. Instead of waiting till I saw whether principle would lead Mr Ewing to leave the establishment, I proposed to him terms which sufficiently secured his worldly interest. He may now tell me he got nothing from me, and that he has been supported by those to whom he preached the gospel; but he is not ignorant that to a man of abilities a house much smaller than the Tabernacle, is a full security * for a larger income than he enjoyed in Lady Glenorchy's chapel. He is not ignorant that most of the dissenting ministers in this country, are supported by means of their places of worship, although these are often considerably encumbered. Mr Ewing therefore ran no risk. This was so notorious, that many ascribed his leaving Lady Glenorchy's chapel to selfish principles.

Mr Ewing has added, as an appendix to his book, a letter from Mr Orme at Perth, one of his brethren, as he says, in the ministry. This letter is of such a character, that I once intended to pass it in silence, not supposing that an answer to such a performance could be expected. It has been suggested, however, that this would be improper, as Mr Ewing has thought it right, to connect it with his accusations, and so to give it all the weight in his power, and as the charges it contains are so specific. I shall therefore now advert to its con-

* Seceders are not afraid to become bound for stipends, even in houses where there is debt, having a *moral certainty* that the money will be raised.

tents, and in doing so, it will be necessary to give a general statement of all my transactions relative to the Tabernacle at Perth.

Mr Orme is a young man who belonged to the class in Edinburgh. About two years ago, on an application from the church at Perth, he was sent there to preach. When he went to that place, his sentiments respecting the order of a church, were very different from those which he now holds. After he had been there about nine months, the church invited him to become a pastor, along with two others who had been chosen from among themselves. On this occasion he wrote and informed me of their choice of him, and of his intention to undertake the office. From the tenor of this letter, however, it was evident that his sentiments were considerably changed.

As this might be the case rather in regard to the principles on which the church attended to the ordinances, than in regard to their practice, it was probable that the change might be little, if at all known to the church. At any rate, such was the aspect which the letter bore towards those who were to be his colleagues, to whom he particularly referred, that I was certain they must be under a misapprehension respecting his opinions, otherwise it was impossible they could think of acting along with him in the pastoral office. In this situation I conceived, that in justice to the church, and to Mr Orme, but especially to his intended colleagues, it was my duty to inform these gentlemen of what I knew, and to lay his communication before them for their consideration.

Knowing how delicate such matters are, how liable to be misunderstood, and to give offence, it did not appear to be proper to send his letter to Perth, which I was sure would only have stirred up dissension. I

therefore wrote to one of them, saying, in general terms, that I had received such a letter from Mr Orme, as rendered it proper for them to deliberate as to what they were doing. I added, that I earnestly wished they could make it convenient to come to Edinburgh along with him, in order that the letter might be considered, and every thing fully explained and understood among them; for that in entering into a new situation, it was of the utmost importance to know distinctly the ground on which they stood.

In consequence of the information I gave them, they came to Edinburgh with Mr Orme. I then pointed out to him the impropriety of entering into the relation proposed, if he and the other pastors differed so much as it appeared from his letter they did. We also conversed fully on the sentiments which his letter contained. On considering the matter, he professed to renounce those opinions which seemed to be a bar to their co-operation; and to revert to the sentiments which he entertained when first he went to Perth. I can call him and the others to witness to the delicacy with which the whole was conducted; so as to hurt his feelings as little as possible, and at the same time to produce and confirm that mutual confidence which was so desirable. After their return to Perth, he was appointed their co-pastor.

Sometime afterwards, Mr Orme changed his sentiments the fourth time; and although the order of the church continued the same, yet it was understood that he disapproved of the principles on which some parts of it were observed.

In the month of January last, I saw one of the gentlemen who had been his co-pastor, but who had resigned his office. He happened to be in Edinburgh on business; and soon after, the other gentleman, who still

continued to be pastor, also called on me on his way to England. The conversation with both, naturally turned on the state of the church at Perth; and among other things, both of them mentioned Mr Orme's last change. I told them I conceived they were wrong in going on together, observing ordinances in which they were not agreed, and that I thought they should bring the matter to a point, by a full explanation. Within less than a month afterwards, I saw Mr Orme. I spoke to him fully on the business, and mentioned all that I recollected to have heard concerning him. I also told him that I had received the information on which I was proceeding, from those who were in the church with him. He did not deny the change in his sentiments; some things which were advanced he did not admit, but asserted they were misrepresented or misunderstood. I endeavoured, however, to point out to him, that if he was really of different sentiments from those which he formerly held, and on the profession of which he was ordained, he ought to state this to the church, and publicly oppose whatever he conceived to be wrong among them, either in practice, or in the principle on which it was observed. I particularly dwelt on the impropriety of my own conduct, in advising that so young a man should be appointed to the elder's office. I stated that I thought we were all much to blame in having broken through the apostolic regulation, which directs that an elder should not be a novice; and that this, in respect to me, was even aggravated in the present case, from the account that was given to me of him when he went to Perth, as he was represented to be 'a forward young man.' I told him, that after all this, it was myself chiefly, and not him, that I blamed; and I hoped I had learned such a lesson from it, as I should never forget.

As soon as Mr Orme returned to Perth, he brought forward the things I had stated. I understand that every thing was at length explained and adjusted to mutual satisfaction, and that it was agreed between him and his colleague, and the brethren who adhered to the one or to the other, that they should separate on account of their difference of sentiment, but that their separation should be amicable. Their parting was the more necessary, as his colleague, who had for some time been considering the subject of baptism, was about that time convinced that he had formerly been mistaken respecting that ordinance.

When this separation happened, one or other of the parties must of course leave the house. As I was now the sole creditor, and the house, according to the books of the trustees, owed me about L. 2000, and had actually cost me more than L. 3000, I thought it was my duty, as far as depended on me, to prefer accommodating that part of the church whose sentiments I approved, and who, in respect to their principles, except in the article of baptism, were standing on the original footing on which Mr Orme was ordained. I accordingly advised the two gentlemen who were the only trustees of the chapel at Perth, (except one, who I understood joined neither party), to retain the house. At first they proposed to decline this, but afterwards informed me, that they were of the same opinion, and had notified to Mr Orme, that they would retire in the mean time, and leave the house to him and his friends, but that they retained their right to it. In this state of things, Mr Orme wrote to me the two following letters. I subjoin my answers. They were kept on scraps of paper which I have with difficulty read. But I do not know that one word is altered.

MY DEAR SIR, *Perth, March 7, 1809.*

I sit down to write you my thoughts on a subject which has given me much uneasiness, and which has cost me much trouble. Various reasons induce me to do this. The esteem which I ever had for you, made me extremely sorry that you should be so strongly, and, as I was convinced, unjustly prejudiced against me. I was conscious that I had ever done what was in my power to promote the peace, comfort, and edification of the church; and I was utterly confounded to find that I had been represented by others, and viewed by you, as a corrupter and destroyer of the cause of God; and that you considered me a striking proof of the evil of young men being over churches of Christ. I have no inclination to enter with you on any discussion about our sentiments; to our own Master, in this matter, we stand or fall. I am only concerned that you should not view me through a distorted medium, and that that should not be laid to a system which belongs to misrepresentation.

It might naturally have been expected, from the view which you informed me some in the church had of my sentiments and conduct, and the very improper manner in which it appeared to me they had acted, if they had any thing to lay to my charge, that I would no longer go on with them while this continued to be the case. I told you, when I saw you, I would bring it to a point; and I did so immediately on my return. I know you have already received accounts of these things, but it may not be unnecessary for me briefly to state the result. As the whole church were perfectly acquainted with my sentiments and conduct, they were fully able to judge whether I had been guilty of the things laid to my charge. It affords me great pleasure to say, that when the whole matter was discussed, every charge was given up. It was acknowledged that some of the things were totally without foundation, never having existed but either in groundless suspicion or misrepresentation. With respect to other things, they acknowledged that they had supposed I had design when I really had none, which they now believed, and which they never would have believed, had not some been disposed to make me an offender for a word, and to construe the most trifling circumstances in the worst light. On the whole, they admitted, that they had sinned against God and me, in cherishing and circulating among themselves and others, for many months, grudges and evil surmisings against me, which they never asked me to explain, nor so much as hinted to me.

The church as a body, both those who separated and those who remain, professed to be satisfied with the propriety of my conduct. I hope, Sir, that this will satisfy you. If it be a church of Christ, which I suppose you will admit, its decision ought to be respected, especially as no means were used by me to produce that decision, but fair explanation. I freely forgive our brethren wherein they have wronged me, and hope that it will be a lesson to them in future to respect more highly the authority of Christ. A separation however was necessary, and indeed desirable for both par-

ties; both on account of the difference betwixt Mr S. and me about baptism, and likewise on account of the idea which some of the brethren entertained about my sentiments respecting exhortation. That separation took place in a peaceable manner, to the satisfaction of all. Separation is painful; but when we cannot go on comfortably together, it is better for each to act on their own sentiments.

Of ninety that were in the church, about seventy go on with me; the rest are either with Mr S. or chuse to remain neutral for a time. No change of any importance has taken place amongst us. The church attends to every thing that it ever attended to; and last Lord's day, as many of the brethren exhorted as ever have done so, since it was adopted. We wish our brethren well, and earnestly pray that the time may yet come when we shall see eye to eye, and be enabled to strive together for the furtherance of the gospel.

By a note from Mr S. I learn that you wish us to remove out of the Tabernacle. He states that they had 'solicited you by letter to allow us to remain; but as you were desirous that they should keep it, of course they do so.' Now, my dear Sir, I hope you will allow me to make a few observations on this. I entreat you to consider them seriously, and to reflect on the important consequences involved in this measure. Faith, we know, cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. To prevent the preaching of the gospel to a thousand or fifteen hundred persons, is a matter of infinite moment. I believe you think a congregation a secondary object; but surely there can be no impropriety in using lawful means to gain an audience, or any propriety in using means directly calculated to put them away. The attendance at the Tabernacle during this winter, has been much better than formerly, particularly in the evenings. Our brethren know the doctrine I have uniformly preached in it, and, I doubt not, approve of it. By our removal from the Tabernacle, some hundreds will be driven away from hearing what is able to make them wise unto salvation. Surely, my dear Sir, it is a solemn consideration to be the means of doing this. You had need to be very sure that you are doing God service. Consider the good that has already been done in this way; and O what a poignant reflection will it be to you on a death-bed, to think that by this step some precious souls may be lost. For your own sake, I entreat you to do nothing rashly.

Our brethren do not consider that the house will be any acquisition to them. Their number is small, and in all probability will continue so, at least for some time; so strong are the prejudices of the people to them. They can easily be accommodated more comfortably to themselves, while there is no place in Perth capable of containing us. It is surely very disagreeable for thirty or forty persons to meet in a house capable of containing fifteen hundred. And how painful the idea, if, in consequence of this step, and the impossibility of finding a place to meet in, a numerous church should be dispersed, and many prevented from hearing the word of life. I am persuaded that money is not your object, and

I am sure that Christianity does not warrant such a step. I beg your serious attention to the conduct of the apostle Paul, Philip. i. 15,—18. Consider if you will be following his example, if you prevent me from preaching Christ, not from envy and strife, but from good-will, and sincerely; and reflect, that while you deprive us of that which is of great value, both to us and the town at large, you bestow no real advantage on them.

Besides, Sir, I am persuaded, and they are also persuaded of this, that our going out of the house, and their coming into it, would be extremely hurtful to them. If the prejudices of the people are strong now, they will be much stronger then. Is not this like adding to the offence of the cross? Were I in their stead, I would not go into the Tabernacle were you to wish it, as circumstances now stand.

Believe me, my dear Sir, nothing of a personal or sinister nature leads me to write you on this subject. I have now by me a pressing and unanimous invitation from a more numerous church, to labour among them, where I believe I should be more comfortable than I have ever been in Perth, or expect to be. But I am attached to the church, and I know that they are sincerely attached to me. There is still much need for the gospel here; and if I am able to excite any attention to it, it grieves me to think of abandoning the prospect. I trust I have chiefly in view the glory of the Redeemer, and the good of my fellow-men; and I shall, I hope, be willing to make all the sacrifices in my power to accomplish them.

The church is indeed poor, and you have, no doubt, a good deal of money on the house; but the brethren are willing to make all the exertions in their power, to pay what part of the interest you shall think proper. Or if you would be so kind as to mention a rent for the whole, we would consider whether we were able to pay it for a year or not. And if we could, we shall find you security for the payment of it. Or if, as I understand a considerable sum was raised by subscription, you would deduct this, if not already consumed, and likewise the price of the galleries, which the trustees inform me you made in a present to the church, you would mention the sum, perhaps a purchase might be thought of, and in some time the capital discharged. It is very evident, that though the Tabernacle were sold, it would not bring nearly what it originally cost, with all the debt that is upon it. The church has certainly the first claim.

I hope, Sir, you will take my observations in good part, and pay what attention you deem necessary to my proposals. At any rate, as I know you are not disposed to distress us, we trust you will allow us to remain till Whitsunday, that we may see whether Providence will provide another place for us.

We may not agree about some things, but I hope we agree about more than we differ. Ought we not sometimes to consider these things. If Jesus shews us compassion, and bears long with us, notwithstanding all our errors, we surely have a claim on the compassion and forbearance of our fellow-Christians. Our Lord's rule is worthy of your attention, "Whatsoever ye would that

men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Any thing like oppression among the disciples of Jesus, or that may have this appearance to the world, is calculated to injure the cause of Christ, and throw a stumbling-block in their way.

I believe, Sir, that my sentiments have been represented to you in the strongest light, and that a greater change of mind has been laid to my charge, than what actually has taken place. Thus the difference has been made as wide as possible, not, I fear, from the purest motives. I know well the person from whom you received the principal accounts respecting me, A. Stewart. I am sorry to say, that in more instances than one he has said the most improper things about me, and even what was not according to truth, with a view to prejudice persons against me by whom I am esteemed. Nor am I the only person he has treated in this manner. I say not these things, Sir, from prejudice. With him I neither have, nor wish to have any acquaintance; and nothing that he can say will ever injure me. I merely suggest this, to put you on your guard against receiving and countenancing reports, which may sometimes deceive you, and lead you, as in my own case, to interfere in the affairs of churches of which you are not a member, and with whose circumstances, as in my own case, you may not be fully acquainted. Allow me likewise to mention, that I do think you ought not to have given advices to Messrs M. and S. or interfered with them and me as you did, previous to your either seeing or writing to me, especially as they had never spoken to me. I also think that the manner in which you spoke to me on the matter, was by no means calculated to conciliate me. You seemed rather disposed to brow-beat me; and my feelings were so much hurt by such an exhibition of charges, of which I had never before heard, that I did not get the better of it for some time. I am ready to believe, however, you intended it for good. I have just one thing more to mention, and then I have done. The church wished to know how money matters stood betwixt them and you. I requested a sight of the ledger; and received in answer from the trustees, 'I am not at liberty to shew the Tabernacle ledger, 'till authorized by Mr R. H.' Now, Sir, I presume we have a right to know; and if the book is not shewn at the desire of the church, it will be concluded that the transactions have not been honourable. I hope you will order them to shew it, to prevent reflections on yourself, as you know we can obtain it another way. Begging your excuse for troubling you with so long an epistle, and hoping to receive an answer soon, I am respectfully yours,

WILLIAM ORME.

Answer to the above.

DEAR SIR, *Edinburgh, March* 11. 1809.

I HAVE received your letter of the 7th, and observe its contents. I have requested Mr D. to examine the accounts of the Tabernacle. In the mean time, as far as depends on me, you are welcome to see any books or accounts on the subject. You cannot, on reflection, desire to keep the house, unless you pay the

debt which it owes. Excepting the settlement of that debt, however, I have nothing to say to it. You may depend on it, I have no wish any longer to interfere in any thing regarding the church matters. These are entirely distinct from the house. Any thing like interference has been in the way of assistance. When applied to formerly, I was the means of your going to the church. Afterwards, I advised with them and you about your being appointed a pastor. The interest too for the debt, which should have been sent to me, was retained for your support.

In our conversation, it was by no means my intention to hurt your feelings. I am sorry if I said any thing that might unnecessarily do so. But I thought it my duty, considering the part I had in the business, to state to you what I did, and fully to confess wherein I considered that I had done wrong.

You observe, you are sure that I am not disposed to distress you. You may depend on it that this is true. But while I would attempt no opposition were it in my power, I do not consider myself any longer called on to give active support as I have hitherto done. I shall write to Mr S. about the accounts. If you or your friends have any thoughts of purchasing the house, you can let me know. I believe the debt is above L. 1800. I speak from memory, as Mr D. has all the papers. Some donations were given besides for Mr Garie, which I paid with interest to Mrs Garie. I do not know the amount of other donations, or if they exceeded mine, which, to the best of my recollection, was L. 200. Every thing in the business ought now to be definitively settled, as no new light on the subject can be expected. Any arrangement as to letting, is therefore out of the question. I presume, however, that Messrs S. and M. will have no objection to your occupying the house, as you desire, till Whitsunday. But as to this, you must settle with them. I am, my dear Sir, &c.

ROBERT HALDANE.

From Mr Orme.

DEAR SIR, *Perth, March* 28. 1808.

WE have received an account of your intentions respecting the Tabernacle, and observe what you say concerning the debt upon it. You wish us either to remove, or to settle that debt immediately, which you say is about L. 1800. Were it possible for us to be accommodated elsewhere at present, or could we pay up this debt, we should say nothing; but as we find both impracticable in the mean time, we think it our duty to address you as a church of Christ, reminding you of some circumstances which have taken place betwixt us, and which induce us to think that it is your duty, as a Christian, to accept of the interest of your money for a little, till it is possible for us to procure another place. We beg you to remember, that you have been a principal means of bringing a great part of this debt upon the church. After that Paul's chapel was purchased for a L. 1000, you interfered, and wished the church to give it up, and to think of building a larger place, promising to give us what assistance was necessary. Had

this house been retained, considering the subscriptions received, it would not have been beyond our power to redeem it. But now although the ground on which the Tabernacle stands was purchased with L.400 of the money given in donations, and L.589 of the same money be expended on this house, we are yet L.596 in debt, more than the whole purchase of that chapel. Unbounded confidence was reposed in you, and it was never suspected we could have been distressed with that debt so much as we are at present, or else we never would have had any thing to do with such a house.

It was wholly at your desire that the galleries were put in. The church did not want them, nor were they ever consulted on the subject. You never asked nor received any interest for what they cost, and they were always understood in the light of a gift. Again, did you not give us to understand by Mr Little, that you would not ask above L.50 yearly interest, if the church would pay you that. And when Messrs M. and S. were sent to you two years ago, to tell you that we were unable to pay it, you desired them to inform us, that you would not distress us for it. Since that time, you have never made any demand. We are the very same now that we were then. Some have left us, but this has been owing to a change of sentiment on their part, and not on ours. Your interest cannot be said to have been retained to support our pastor, because that was your own wish, and had he not been here, it is not likely there would have been any interest to give. We do not request you to give us active support. All we ask is, that you allow us to retain the house for a year at least, as we cannot now be accommodated, for which we are willing to pay you the L.50 of interest. You have not yet lost any thing on the Tabernacle, as, if it fall into your hands, all the money subscribed which is sunk on it, will go to pay the interest you have not got.

These things lead us to think, Sir, that in justice you ought not to distress us, but to accede to our proposal. Must it not be throwing a great temptation in our way, only to give or withhold, when our sentiments and practices correspond with your own? We expect as a Christian and a man of feeling, that you will pay some attention to our circumstances. That you will have some regard for your own character, which will be implicated a good deal, in removing us from the Tabernacle at present. Above all, we entreat you to consider the influence it will have on the cause of Christ. If we are allowed to remain a little longer, we hope to be able to make provision for ourselves, and then no reflections will be made. We have not consulted with Messrs M. and S. as they can only act as trustees for us while they are connected with the church; and as you are best acquainted with the promises you made to us, we leave it with yourself, whether the statement be correct or not. If any thing is wrong, we are not to blame, as every document has been taken out of our hands. We trust from the connexion that has hitherto subsisted betwixt

us, and as professing the same faith, that you will listen to our request, and return us a favourable answer. We are, dear Sir, most sincerely yours.

Signed in name of the church,

WM. ORME.
JOHN MALLOCH.

P.S. Are we to expect the statement from Mr D.

Answer to the above.

MY DEAR SIR, *Edinburgh, April* 5. 1809.

I RECEIVED your letter of the 28th ult. I observe its contents, but allow me to say, that it is not well calculated to attain the end you have in view. It is to no purpose to attempt to place on the footing of obligation, what has proceeded all along on that of favour. Nor does your taking it for granted, that you and your friends are to be considered exclusively as the church, at all forward the matter, nor your alleging that there is no change, after speaking of your own in the former letter. Your intimating that there would probably have been no money to pay as interest unless you had been there, might come better from another than from you. However, I do not enter farther into these things, than to observe that your statements are very incorrect. For instance, the reason of not purchasing Paul's chapel was, that after the agreement was conditionally made, the title deeds which were examined by one of the most respectable men of business in Edinburgh, were found not to be good. L. 348 : 8 : 1, including L. 20 : 18 : 1 interest from me, was the amount of the subscriptions received at the beginning by Mr Garie. I gave L. 200 more. I paid Mrs Garie L. 221 : 9 : 6, principal and interest, as the part of L. 348, 8s. 1d. subscribed for her husband. This left L. 126 : 18 : 7 ; but on the other hand, there was a balance due to the treasurer of the church, on leaving Paul's chapel, for the church's expences, salary, &c. of L. 134 : 13 : 10. The ground as paid with interest, cost L. 420 and L. 11, 17 s. expences, examining titles, &c.

Notwithstanding your letter, however, which makes so much against acceding to your proposal, without saying any thing further about that at present, I shall write to Mr S. and mention it to him. I shall inclose to him Mr D.'s account, and on the other side I send you a copy of what I have written to him concerning the account. I am, &c.

P.S. Besides what appears in the accounts, instead of receiving any interest, I have paid in aid of the church, L. 502 : 16 : 8.

In my answers to Mr Orme's letters, I did not enter into his reasonings, which were intended to shew, that on the principles of the gospel, his claim for retaining the house ought to be preferred. This I thought quite unnecessary, after the full explanation he and I had together, and as the difference of our sentiments was well understood. If the reasons, in their connexion, which he has brought forward, were admitted, they would prove, that the house should have been given to the most popular preacher, of whatever denomination of Christians. As to usefulness, the prospect of attaining the greatest lay, I conceived, in the degree of conformity to the word of God in the ordinances observed, and in the comparative ability of the two parties to edify and instruct. On these points, Mr Orme knew that his opinion and mine were entirely opposite. In my replies I therefore confined myself as much as possible to the business of the house.

I have received from Perth, the following remarks on some parts of his first letter.

'The things laid to Mr Orme's charge, were never 'told to the church, so it could not judge as to them.

'Mr Orme acknowledged, that our inferences from 'the different parts of his conduct mentioned, were *fair*, 'and so could not proceed from a disposition to make 'him an offender for a word.

'Mr Orme was informed, (although perhaps not 'early) that a number of the brethren, as well as those 'who informed him, were offended at his conduct.

'There were several of those who remained with 'him, who were previously not satisfied with his '*conduct*; and those who separated, were far from be-'ing satisfied with his sentiments on exhortation, and 'his corresponding conduct. The church, as a body,

'were not called upon to express their sentiments, with 'regard to this, or our *conduct* or sentiments, but only 'if it was satisfied with the *mutual acknowledgments*, 'both of Mr Orme and of us.

'Exhortation is not now attended to in his church as 'an ordinance, but as a matter of *expediency*; and the 'prayers of the brethren on the Lord's day are entirely 'dropped.

'Could nobody preach the gospel in the Ta-'bernacle but Mr Orme? Could A. Stewart not do 'so?'

In addition to these observations, I would notice, that the passage in Philip. i. 15. 18. to which my attention is called in his letter, had nothing to do with the question at issue, and that from the connexion in which he quotes it, Mr Orme does not appear to understand its meaning.

The account which Mr Orme gives of Mr Stewart, is a very improper one. During the time he was in Edinburgh attending the class, which was, I believe, more than three times as long as Mr Orme was in it, his conduct was correct and exemplary; nor do I at present recollect any complaints that were made against him, or any uneasiness excited in regard to his general spirit or conduct, arising from forwardness, or the want of that modesty and sobriety of mind so becoming young men, which is more than I can say for Mr Orme. I am convinced that he would speak nothing but the truth; and I have no reason to think that he gave me a distorted account of Mr Orme's conduct. It might be well asked, as above, could not he preach the gospel in the Tabernacle? and, it may be added, had not he more experience than Mr Orme?

I shall now advert to Mr Orme's letter to Mr

Ewing; and as the view it presents of my conduct to the church at Perth is so extraordinary, I must be allowed to be more minute in my remarks, than I could otherwise have wished. It contains an assertion three times repeated, that he and his friends were not to be allowed to remain in the house 'either for love or money;' that I had determined they should go out, whatever inconvenience it might put them to; and again, that I am determined to turn the church in the Tabernacle into the streets. This is directly contrary to fact. When Mr Orme, in his first letter to me, proposed to retain the house, I wrote him in reply, that as no new light could be thrown on the business, a lease was out of the question, and that every thing ought now to be settled; if, however, they had thoughts of purchasing, that he might inform me, and that the debt was so much. But when, in his second letter, he said it was impossible to pay the debt, or to procure accommodation elsewhere, and made a definite proposal to take the house for one year, and to pay L. 50 as part of the interest, I told him, in my answer, that I should write to the other gentlemen on the subject. In the mean time, I stated the matter to Mr D., who kept my copy of the accounts of the house, and who was acquainted with the whole business, and he and I agreed, that the plan now proposed by Mr Orme, should be acceded to, provided the others agreed to it. I therefore resolved to write to Mr S., and mention the proposal to him, when I could send him the accounts that were then making out. The accounts, however, took some time to prepare, as they were to be collected from various documents, and to be examined from the beginning. Mr D. had not returned them when Mr S. wrote me, April 18, saying, he understood that Mr Orme had received a letter from me, in which I promised to write

him (Mr S.) on the subject of it, and that as he had not received any letter, he now informed me, that it had been resolved, at a public meeting, by Mr Orme and his friends, to send a deputation to him on the 20th inst., and that he therefore wished to have the intended letter on that day. I wrote him by return of post on the 19th, stating what Mr Orme had proposed as to retaining the house for another year, and sending him such of the accounts as were prepared. Next day I received the remainder of the accounts, and forwarded them to him on Friday the 21st. This was before I saw Mr Ewing's book. Such being the actual state of matters, what shall I say of the statement which Mr Orme has given to the public?

Mr Orme says, 'Nor will he give us a fair account 'of the state of matters.' So far was this from being the case, that, in my answer to his letter, I told him that he was welcome, as far as depended on me, to see any books or accounts on the subject. It was my particular request to the trustees at Perth, that they would shew him every thing; which they have informed me was done. Their declining to do so at first, till they should hear from me, arose, I believe, from an apprehension that attempts would be made to give trouble at law on the subject. Any other accounts that I could furnish, were the entries in my own books, of what money I had given or lent to the institution. And in order to give every information in my power, I directed Mr D. to go over all the relative papers from the beginning, and to make an abstract of the whole, classifying the different matters, donations, loans, and aids to the church. This was done as speedily as he could overtake it, and the abstract was sent, before Mr Ewing's book appeared; and, according to my request, was immediately com-

municated to Mr Orme. Was not this doing more than could have been reasonably required? for the proper and only subject of investigation, was, not my own book surely, but the book of the trustees, which was neither mine, nor in my possession.

In connexion with his complaint about the accounts, he says that I place the gift of the house, and '*all the* '*other matters*,' in the hands of one who has left them; and in his last letter to me, he says, 'Every document 'has been taken out of our hands.' Nothing that I know of has been taken out of his hands. All the books and documents remain, as I believe they always did, in the hands of the trustees.

Mr Orme thinks, that I told him what was not true, when I said in Edinburgh, that all the information, from which I was speaking to him, I had received from those in the church with him. This was strictly true; and when he mentioned, in his first letter above, that I had got my information about him from another, I saw no necessity to notice it in my answer; nor did I ever think of doing so, because there was no discrepancy between my having received all the information I communicated to him from those in his church, and having also heard it from another. He likewise complains, that I received reports to his prejudice, and spoke of them to others, and not to himself. As soon as I saw him, I spoke of the whole to himself; but as these reports related to parts of his public conduct, in which others were implicated, I never supposed that I ought not to speak of them, especially to those by whom they were repeated, until I should see him.

Mr Orme asserts, that when I learned that the church at Perth had an eye to Mr W., I caused my man of business to write again and again demanding the inter-

est, after the church understood I would not distress them for it. It could be with no other view, he says, than to prevent the church taking that step. When I was asked my opinion about Mr W.'s being invited to go to Perth, and to leave the church over which he was pastor, I certainly gave it, and disapproved of the measure. In itself it was undoubtedly an improper step in the church at Perth, to undertake permanently to support two pastors, when they were not able to provide for one, and when instead of paying me any of the interest which was annually due, I had been obliged to give some hundred pounds to assist them as to their pastors; and the continuance, on my part, of such support would have been inconsistent, without the fullest approbation of their measures. But that correspondence began two or three months, I believe, before Mr W. was at Perth, and the letters to which he alludes, refer chiefly to the settlement about the money which was at that time about to be paid to Mrs Garie.

Mr Orme says that I solemnly promised not to ask above L. 50 a-year of interest. If I did so, this solemn promise has been very faithfully observed, for I have never put into my pocket one farthing of interest from the house at Perth; and ever since Mr Orme has been there, this L. 50 a-year, and whatever more the house could afford, instead of coming to me, has been paid to himself.

He has said, that though the house was built by subscription, I was *allowed* to buy up the debts, and that I *have not yet lost any thing on the Tabernacle.* The incorrectness and rashness of these assertions will be seen from the money accounts of the house, which are afterwards inserted.

Mr Orme represents himself as acting as an instrument of mine, when he went to Perth. He will recollect, however, that he was proceeding on the principles which he *professed* to have received from the word of God. Had I not been fully persuaded of this, he should never (I can honestly say) have had my countenance nor approbation in his going to Perth, or any where else, for the spread of the gospel of grace and truth. But were his statement allowed to be just, it places him in a very lamentable point of view, both at that period and since, and represents him as one "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine;" as having no fixed principles of his own, and therefore a fit tool to be employed by others. This would at least justify all that has been said by others, of his being very ill qualified to fill the elder's office. His inexperience of which he speaks, will now, I hope, become a subject of more serious consideration with himself than it appears to have hitherto been.

The following are answers to some queries, which, in consequence of Mr Orme's printed letter, I put to the gentlemen who are trustees, and who were formerly co-pastors with him. They begin with remarking, 'We were truly grieved on the perusal of Mr Ewing's 'appendix, and could scarce have supposed that Mr 'Orme would have wrote so of you. It must be truly 'painful to you to experience such treatment from 'those who themselves acknowledge that they are "under strong personal obligations" to you *.

'Mr Ewing, in his preamble to Mr Orme's letter has, we presume, forgot himself, when he said, 'that he had no previous correspondence with him on

* An expression used by Mr Orme, in a letter to one of the writers of the above, a short time before he sent his letter to Mr Ewing.

'the subject; for Mr Orme said, after his return from 'Glasgow in September last, that Mr Ewing had shewn 'him a number of folio sheets of paper, which he had 'written in answer to your letters to him, and that he 'had perused them. Of course Mr Ewing certainly had 'personal correspondence with Mr Orme on the subject; 'and we were sorry to observe, that after his return from 'Glasgow, his mind seemed to be filled with prejudice 'against you.

'Mr Orme states, that the Tabernacle here was rai-'sed by subscription. In this he has been misinformed; 'for it appears from the accounts, that the balance of the 'subscriptions, including L. 200 of a donation from your-'self, that remained untouched by the church before 'their leaving Paul's chapel, came considerably short of 'what you paid for the ground on which the Tabernacle 'is built, and the after-subscriptions amounted only to 'about L. 140. You was not merely '*allowed*,' as he 'states, to buy up the debts on the Tabernacle, but you 'was *solicited* by the trustees to do so.

'Mr Orme says, 'A small party broke off about 'baptism and exhortation.' We separated from him and 'his friends, as a church with her office-bearers; and if 'they thought they had any claim to the Tabernacle, 'which we conceive they had not, our church had a right 'to a share of that claim.

'Mr Orme and the church, at the separation, con-'sisted of upwards of sixty members, and ours of more 'than twenty. He says that our church has 'entered 'warmly into your whole system.' We do not know 'what your whole system is; but we know that there 'are some things with regard to churches which you 'hold, that our church does not hold, and those senti-'ments that it holds which are similar to yours, are 'not held, we trust, because they are your's, any more

'than Mr Orme, who holds sentiments which are simi-
'lar to Mr Ewing's, does so merely because they are
'his, for this, we trust, is not the case with regard to
'him.

'Mr Orme states, that you solemnly promised to
'the church through Mr Little, that you would not
'ask above L. 50 yearly interest. He has not been
'informed, that (if such a promise was made) you
'have since advanced to the church a considerable
'sum *more* than you had advanced at that time, for
'which it was agreed to pay you interest; and even
'although this had not been the case, you could not be
'charged with breach of promise, supposing you should
'refuse to give them the Tabernacle for a year for L. 50,
'except *they* were allowed to be the church who only
'had a right to make this claim, and especially because
'the former interest had not been paid.—We know of no
'breach of promise that you have made to the church,
'and we have inquired at one who, from a very early pe-
'riod, had the greatest access to know every transaction,
'and was one of the trustees, and can find not the least
'imputation of any such thing, and considering the
'connexion you stood in to the church, few, very few in-
'deed would have acted in that delicate manner in which
'you have all along done.

'We are surprised at Mr Orme stating that you will
'not give them a fair account of the state of matters; for
'agreeable to your directions to shew him every thing
'and to conceal nothing, we some time ago shewed
'him and a friend along with him, the whole of the Ta-
'bernacle account books, which they examined, and took
'notes of them.

'Mr Orme speaks as if you would not allow them
'any time to provide for themselves. He appears to for-
'get that betwixt the time of the separation in the

'church, there is a lapse of nearly three months to 'Whitsunday, nor do we think there is any great danger 'of their being "cast to the streets," as he expresses 'himself, for we have no reason to doubt that they could 'immediately get possession of the grammar school room, 'to occupy it in the forenoon, which would contain three 'times the number, we believe, who attend with them at 'that time of the day, and the Guild hall afternoon and 'evening, which will hold more than double the num-'ber of his church.'

On the 10th of May, which was three weeks after Mr Orme's letter to Mr Ewing, Mr Orme sent the following note to Mr S., one of the trustees, who in answer referred him to me, but forwarded his note by post.

MY DEAR SIR, *May* 10. 1809.

THE church, according to your intimation, has been looking out for a place to meet in, but before fixing, we wish to know if you possess any information on the subject, whether it is intended we should remove. As various reports are circulated, we wish to understand the real state of matters. If we do not get *positive intimation to remove before the* 15*th*, we shall understand that we keep possession for the ensuing year, and in the event of opposition, shall consider it our duty to use means to secure it. Of this you may advise Mr Haldane, if you think proper. If we are to remain, please say on what terms, that there may be no dispute afterwards.

An answer to this before Thursday evening, will much oblige, Sir, your humble servant, (Signed) WILLIAM ORME.

I received the above May 11, and next day wrote as follows to Mr S :—

MY DEAR SIR, *Edinburgh, May* 12. 1809.

YESTERDAY I received your favour of the 10th enclosing a copy of Mr Orme's letter to you of the same date. In my last letter to him of the 5th ult, I said that I would mention to you his proposal, that he and his friends should continue to occupy the Tabernacle for another year, on paying fifty pounds. This, you will recollect, I did in my letter of the 18th. Upon receiving his proposal, and consulting Mr D. on the subject, I was of opinion, that if you and your friends acquiesced, it ought to be acceded to. I observe from your answer to me, dated April 21. that you were

much of the same opinion, although it appears from the end of your letter, that it strikes a number of your friends in a different light. I did not reply to you on that business, as Mr Orme's printed letter arrived in the interval.

Still, even after Mr Ewing's book of calumny has appeared, with the officious and slanderous letter of Mr Orme at the end of it, I am disposed, so far as I am concerned, to adhere to my first sentiments. If any thing could alter these, it would be Mr Orme's notice, which you have enclosed to me. This avowed intention of a deliberate departure from the rule of the word of God, which so expressly prohibits Christians from going to law respecting their differences among themselves, and which inculcates principles of so opposite a tendency, I could not have expected.

As I told Mr Orme formerly, excepting the settlement of the debt, I have nothing to say to the business. I therefore do not consider myself at liberty to dictate in the matter. And while I do not wish to act from any hostile feeling to Mr Orme, I cannot retract any thing I have said, on which your friends have been led to place reliance as to the use of the house. I am still of opinion that you have the best right to it. You and Mr M'R. who is joined with you, are the only trustees at Perth, except Mr M. who, you informed me, is neutral. You were both co-pastors with Mr Orme, and excepting baptism, you stand, I believe, on the same principles on which the church was proceeding when you were all together, and on the profession of which Mr Orme was ordained. In the present case, however, it appears to me, at least, that it would be best to wave your right. At all events, I am sure you would never think of contending *at law about such a matter*, which I am convinced is completely contrary to the principles of all of you. If you decide that this is the proper course for you to follow, you can communicate it to Mr Orme, and I send you a form of a missive directed to you as trustees, which in that case he should transcribe, in order to preclude all further misunderstanding. If they possess the house, the rent would of course be fifty pounds, which Mr Orme has told the public, they are ready to give.

I am, my dear Sir, &c.

Mr S. on the day he received the above letter, sent a note to Mr Orme to inform him, that he would be allowed to possess the Tabernacle another year, upon agreeing to the missive that was enclosed, which he would in that case sign with one or two of his deacons, and return that evening. The missive simply bound them to pay the rent which they had offered, and to remove at the end of a twelvemonth.

Mr Orme replied that it was not possible to get the missive signed that day, it being late on Saturday even-

ing; that it required consideration and a meeting of the church; and that, for reasons he did not then assign, he could not give nor subscribe such an obligation.

Next day, Sabbath 14, Mr Orme read to his church the note from Mr S. by which the possession of the Tabernacle was offered them for another year. He intimated however, that unless notice was given to the contrary, they would meet the following Lord's day in the Glover's hall. Early on Monday the 15th, he carried off the moveables that belonged to the Tabernacle. When they heard this, the trustees requested to have the keys, that they might know what was taken away. Nothing, they declare, but a sense of duty, could have induced them to have any thing to do with such a business. Mr Orme sent a message that he would deliver the keys himself. They had been asked merely for the above purpose. Some other persons, however, were sent by him to deliver the keys, who said they wished to see their right for receiving them. It was replied that their authority lay in being trustees for the house, but they would not receive the keys except a note was given of the articles which had been taken away. This, after some hesitation, the others gave. They said that they went upon the principle of taking of the moveables whatever they saw entered in the cash book, as having been paid out of the funds of the church. It was replied, that this was acting unjustly, as they had not paid the interest due, for which, whatever was the amount given for these articles, the money to be remitted came proportionably short; and besides, although their account on that score had been clear, surely they had not a right to the whole, for as the brethren had separated as two churches, unquestionably the other church had a right to a share.

The offer of the Tabernacle was introduced into the

conversation, when it appeared thal the church had been completely misled, respecting the conditions of the missive. Finding this to be the case, the trustees said, that in order that no undue advantage might be taken of them, they again renewed the offer of the Tabernacle, and gave them till Wednesday evening to return an answer. Mr Orme, in consequence, sent and requested a meeting on that evening. He however, did not attend it: but his friends who were present stated, that they had no doubt the church would agree to whatever they should do. The trustees informed them, that it was necessary to have a meeting of the church to authorize them how to act, and again, in order not to force matters, gave them till Thursday evening, the night of their weekly meeting, to return an answer. These persons acknowledged the error of the church, in not formerly waiting on the trustees respecting the Tabernacle, which Mr Orme till now had uniformly opposed and prevented.

The church assembled on Thursday evening, and on their dismissal, the trustees met them. Mr Orme said, that the church agreed to the proposal, and that he and the committee would subscribe the paper; that the church would exert themselves to pay the L. 50, but if not able to do so fully, they would trust to Mr Haldane's generosity. The trustees replied, that if they were not authorized to subscribe the missive as it stood, they had better delay it, and as they were at a loss where to meet next Lord's day, (having been informed that they could not now get the Glover's hall,) they should be welcome to meet in the Tabernacle. After some further conversation, they signed the missive.

It has been very unpleasant to me to detail all the above business, especially the removal of the articles from the Tabernacle, which I could not have supposed

would have been thought of. As far however as I was concerned, Mr Orme was perfectly welcome to them; but I hope the recollection of this procedure, and indeed of his general conduct in the business, especially his letter to Mr Ewing, will be viewed by him, some time hence, with becoming regret.

Many reports, I am informed, are circulated respecting my conduct to Mr Garie's family, and the money subscribed by others for the Perth Tabernacle, which is said to amount to a very large sum. It therefore becomes necessary to state these matters as they really stand.

The late Mr Garie applied to me for aid to purchase or build a meeting house in Perth. Conceiving that it was an important station, and wishing to assist him, I was desirous to forward his views. He had obtained donations among his friends to the amount of L. 327, 10s. * Included in this sum was L. 166, 18s. which the donors declared in the paper they subscribed was given for the behoof of Mr Garie as an individual. When he came to me I subscribed L. 200, and he hoped that more would be procured from other quarters. A negotiation was then entered into, to purchase a chapel in Perth for L. 1000; and every thing was conditionally settled, when, on examination, the title deeds were found not to be good.

A scheme was next proposed for building a house. Two gentlemen engaged to lend L. 100 each, to be added to the sum already in hand; and I agreed to lend L. 100 more, and to advance on the security of another

* He deposited the above sum with me Nov. 23. 1798, and I paid it so far as it went, for the ground, on March 4. 1800, with the interest, at 5 per cent, L. 20 : 18 : 1, making L. 348 : 8 : 1.

what more might be wanted, after all that could be obtained from others. A paper to the above effect specifying the size of the house, was drawn up and signed by the above two gentlemen and me. At settling the preliminaries a clause was inserted, declaring that as the L. 166, 18s. was given to Mr Garie as an individual, he or his heirs should retain a right to claim the same from the property at his departure from the chapel by death or otherwise, and after the debt upon it should be paid. This clause was added solely at my request. Indeed I urged it upon Mr Garie, who was reluctant to make such a reservation, as he was receiving so much assistance, without which that sum would not have availed.

Ground was then purchased and the building of a house contracted for. To assist in the work, several sums were lent by Mr Garie's friends at Perth. In a very short time, however, trouble arose from this quarter. These sums were all quickly called up or expected to be so, and as very little more had been obtained in the way of subscription, it was found, that unless I advanced the money all would stand still. In this situation I was *allowed*, as the public are now told, to pay up the debts, and to answer the large drafts that from time to time became due for the erection of the house. As I had advanced so much on the house, and the only remaining debt being L. 200 owing to the above two gentlemen, it was thought best that I should also pay them up, and as more demands were constantly made which there was no other person to answer, that I should become the sole creditor. I accordingly paid the above sum. One of them however gave up L. 50 as a donation, and both remitted the interest. When this arrangement took place, the amount of the money advanced on the security of the third gentleman having greatly exceeded

what was expected, he was allowed to withdraw his security on giving a donation of L. 30.

Mr Little was by this time come to Perth, and corresponded with me about the expences of the house. Galleries were added to it, for which I advanced L. 377. Whether the idea of erecting them originated with him or with me, I do not recollect. For these it is stipulated in the trust deed, that no interest shall be required till after the other debt is paid. The payment of the debt which was always increasing, was before that time a hopeless cause.

After Mr Garie's death a committee of gentlemen in Perth undertook to attend to the interest of his widow and children. A considerable subscription was raised for them, to which amongst others I contributed. The committee began to turn their attention to the L. 166, 18s. to see if they could recover it for their use. The trustees were applied to for this purpose. On being written to by the committee, and waited on by one of their number, I produced the above mentioned paper, the only document on which the money could be claimed. On this being shewn, it was at once perceived that this money was only payable after the debt was cleared, and it was readily admitted that Mr Garie had a right to settle it in that manner, and that it was proper and necessary for him to do so ; indeed that he could not have been blamed if no such reservation had been made, as the additional assistance which he obtained gave the only rational prospect of procuring a house from whence he might expect to draw any support. It was afterwards supposed, however, that this money might be recovered at law, and intimation was given to the trustees that if not paid, legal means would be resorted to. Inquiry was made whether there was any ground for such a suit, and it was found that there was none.

I was afterwards applied to from time to time on the subject, and the family was represented as standing in need of assistance. I replied, that as to their wants I hoped I should feel the claim these gave on me in common with others, and that I was ready again to subscribe for their relief; but as to the money in question, it could hardly be expected that I should pay it, as there was now no prospect whatever that the debt would be cleared by the subject, and therefore it would neither be more nor less than a payment made out of my own pocket, which certainly it could not be reasonable to ask. Notwithstanding, however, that this was the case, and after Mrs Garie had acknowledged that she had no claim whatever till the debt of the house was discharged, and consequently no prospect of payment, either in her own time or afterwards, I consented to pay her that money, and even gave her the annual interest from the time it had been received by Mr Garie. The trustees agreed, that this sum should be added to the debt of the house, but that no interest for it in the mean time should be required. It was received with the most grateful acknowledgments by all concerned. The date of the payment is April 8, 1807, and it was chiefly relative to this business, that the correspondence, formerly noticed, was carried on in January and February preceding. It was very far from my thoughts ever to have published the above transaction; but at present it appears to be my indispensable duty, as the tongue of calumny has been set in motion by Mr Ewing and Mr Orme, and is, I am informed, in the highest degree virulent and active on this subject.

It is also necessary to publish a state of the accounts of the Tabernacle, to oppose other false accusations, and the various misrepresentations concerning them, that are now circulated.

ACCOUNTS,

PERTH TABERNACLE.

Debt to me at 11th Nov. 1803, according to an account docqueted by the trustees,	£. 1456	0	6
Advanced further, 3d Nov. 1804,	140	0	0
Paid Mrs Garie, 8th April 1807,	221	9	6
	£. 1817	10	0

The whole interest, paid to me since the beginning is,	£. 133	9	0
But this sum was immediately repaid for the assistance of the church, with further sums, given by me, not included in the above debt, to the amount of	478	5	7
Amount paid by me to assist the church, and not charged as a debt,	£. 611	14	7

N. B. There has been no interest paid for some years past, nor is the amount of it which was due, included in the L. 611 : 14 : 7.

The amount of donations from first to last, including £. 20 : 18 : 1 interest, but exclusive of my own donation of £. 200, is,				£. 521	15 1
Deduct part thereof paid by me to Mrs Garie,	£. 221	9	6		
Deduct also part of these donations, which appears from the accounts to have been expended for the rent of Paul's chapel, Mr Garie's salary, &c. and so has not entered at all into the new subject,	£. 134	13	10½	356	3 4½
Balance of these donations,				£. 165	11 8½
Donation by me,				200	0 0
Total donations on the subject,				£. 365	11 8½

The total amount of what the Institution has cost me from the beginning, to May 15. 1809, is,	L. 3474	3	5½

Such is the history of the Perth business, on which I have been compelled by the charges that have been preferred, to be so minute. The expence it has occasioned to me, is seen above. The trouble I have had with it, from first to last, in building the house, correspondence, &c. is not known to any individual but myself. Those with whom it began, are now off the stage. Mr Little succeeded, and he knows what it was for several years. During all the time he was at Perth, he and I continued to co-operate in the most cordial and harmonious manner. Much trouble and pains he took about the temporal concerns of the church; such as I am sure nothing but a sense of duty would have induced him to do. When he left this country to return to England, he requested me, in the most earnest manner, to continue to attend as far as possible to the interests of the church at Perth. I believe he will read with surprize, and not without indignation, many things that have been asserted in Mr Ewing's late book.

If, on reviewing the whole of the transactions with Perth, as above detailed, any one be disposed to judge, that much of what has been done was improper, and led to too much influence on my part, and interference with the church, I shall not dispute it. I can only say, that I am conscious I was actuated all along by a sense of duty, and that nothing besides would have prevailed with me to persevere in the course I have followed, in regard to that place. But I am now sensible, that a system which required so much foreign pecuniary aid, must be wrong; and this is one among many other cases, that has tended to fix the conviction in my mind, that every Christian society should stand completely on its own foundation. The spiritual kingdom of the Lord Jesus, is constituted and regulated in such a manner, that this is within the reach of all its subjects. It is even what is required of

them; and as there is neither precept nor example in the Scriptures to lead to a contrary conclusion, it is both improper and injurious to follow any other plan.

In connexion with what has been said of Perth, it may be proper here to notice the unfounded report, that I was distressing some of the churches, to whom I had lent money. Mr Ewing says, that others gave their money freely, but I often required the security of stamped bonds and legal penalties. He knows well, or might have known, the manner in which I have proceeded in these matters. When a moderate subscription, proportioned to the expence of the house to be built, was required, I generally gave it, as he says others did, and I believe my donations were in proportion to their's. At other times, when a large sum was requisite, I advanced it as a loan which, it was thought, might be gradually paid off. This was often earnestly solicited, and without resorting to this method, I should not have considered it my duty to have given nearly so much as I advanced, and the erection or purchase of many houses must have been prevented. Sometimes I put it in the choice of those who applied to me, whether they would receive a loan, or a more limited gift; and frequently I gave both a donation and a loan. Exclusive of donations, some of which were very considerable, I find that the principal alone, of the money lent by me on houses for worship, and still due, together with what has been paid for those which belong to me, exceeds L. 21,000. How far this sum would come short of the real amount now due on these houses, as hardly any interest at all has been received, may be judged from the foregoing statement of the Perth accounts. Notwithstanding Mr Ewing's attempts to misrepresent every part of my conduct, I believe it will be found that I have laid out my

money as freely as others. Of this, however, I have nothing to boast.

Mr Ewing refers to three cases to prove that I have been distressing the churches, and he cannot conceive on what ground my bold denial of this rests, 'unless it 'be the pitiful one of a quibble on the word distress.' After trifling on the meaning of the word, he takes it for granted, that I intend to avail myself of a 'techni-'cal sense' in which it is used, 'which he could not 'have believed,' had not I referred him to 'a man of 'business, who has managed all these concerns for 'some years past.' But Mr Ewing may make himself easy on this and every other head on which he uses such strenuous efforts to blacken my character. In defending myself, I stand in need of none of his subterfuges. I shall use words in their common and obvious meaning. As to what he says of referring him to a man of business, he should recollect, that the gentleman to whom I refer him, is not only a friend of his own, but is as able to judge of the duties of a Christian (on which Mr Ewing also admonishes me) as Mr Ewing himself, and is fully acquainted with the whole of my transactions in these matters. But Mr Ewing thinks, that my mode of attempting to get myself off, is a confirmation of all that he has said. 'I have no occasion,' says he, 'to consult that gentleman, for I never allud-'ed to any thing done under his management, but to 'what was demanded personally by Mr Haldane him-'self; and I do think, that his mode of attempting to 'get himself off, is a strong confirmation of the truth of 'all that I have said. Although he has not yet, so far 'as I know, made his demand in a legal form, yet in 'one of the cases above alluded to, he surely will not 'deny, that he said he had some thoughts of desiring '(or words to that effect) his man of business, to write

'to the different churches, who had money of him, to 'pay their debt,' p. 178.

The following is the case to which he alludes:—The pastor of one of the churches called on me about a year ago. From what I understood of the state of his church, I thought they should now endeavour to pay up their debt, which was only L. 100. I judged them to be the more able to do so, as I believe they are the only church in Scotland which has regularly paid me interest. I told him it appeared to me to be proper for them to do this; and, lest he should suppose that any thing personal was meant against him or his church, I added, that my opinion was the same as to all the other churches, who ought, as soon as possible, to relieve themselves of every external burden. This was my opinion from the beginning, as must have been known. Of this, whether I then mentioned it to him or not, it was always my intention to remind the churches from time to time. On the same grounds, I had requested the gentleman above referred to, to write to them, giving them a regular state of the interest due, as will appear from his letter below. In the conversation referred to, I neither demanded nor required the money; nor has any part of it been paid.

Mr Ewing has besides referred to what has taken place respecting the churches at Edinburgh and Dundee, who, he says, have been unjustly expelled by me from the Tabernacles. A plain account of what occurred at these places, will set this matter in a proper point of view.

For a considerable time, there had been a material difference of sentiment in the church at Edinburgh respecting exhortation, and it was apprehended that some would go away when this was adopted. My brother's inform-

ing the church of his change of sentiment on baptism, brought matters to a crisis. Some of the members went to the established church, some to the church in College street, others to that in Niddry street, while a considerable number determined to become a separate church, and rented a large room to meet in. The rest remained with my brother in the Tabernacle. These, which were more numerous than any of the other divisions, were of one mind, except on the subject of baptism, which they thought might be made a matter of forbearance. What was then to be done? Was my brother and I, and all who acted along with us, to be put out of the house? Surely this would have been most unreasonable. But here a most palpable misrepresentation in Mr Ewing's account of the separation of the church at Edinburgh, presents itself. 'His brother and 'himself are much misrepresented, if they did not manage 'the division so, as to make it exceedingly difficult for 'members of sentiments opposite to theirs, to get an op-'portunity of speaking,' p. 100. The very reverse of this is the case. My brother informed the church that he could still walk in fellowship with those who differed with him on baptism, but he wished to state to them the reasons of his change of sentiment, and that this would require two sermons. On the following Lord's day, he preached on the general subject of the differences of Christians, without mentioning baptism, and on the two following Lord's days he spoke as he had intimated to them, on baptism. Some were in such haste to be gone, that they would not remain to hear his second discourse. The church then met to converse on what was the path of duty, and so far from any being prevented from speaking their sentiments, all were called on to do so, and the principal cause of ill-humour between those who remained in the Tabernacle, and those who went away, was,

that the latter would not stop longer, and take time, as they were earnestly exhorted, calmly and dispassionately to state their own sentiments, and hear what could be said by their brethren.

Dundee has also been mentioned by Mr Ewing. In the month of September last, Mr I. wrote me, that after the end of the month, he had the prospect of leaving that place. He mentioned that a great majority of the church had changed their sentiments as to the order they had followed respecting exhortation, and had agreed to give it up. The rest continued to observe it, and the two parties had separated. As the house was mine, he wished to know if I would let it to the former for six months, and at what rent. I replied that I could give no answer to this till I knew what was the wish of that part of the church who (although the smallest in number) appeared to have the first claim on me; but if they did not desire to retain it, I would ask no rent from the others for the time proposed. When I communicated this to them, they informed me that they wished to have the house. I then requested them to manage the business in such a way, as not to give the least possible offence to the other party, and to allow them time to provide themselves in another place to meet in. This they were forward to do, and settled the matter in such a way as to receive the thanks of those concerned.

The above are the only instances which could be brought to countenance in the smallest degree, the unfounded report that I was distressing the churches. The very reverse has been the case. They have had no trouble whatever from me; although scarcely one of them has paid any of their interest, due on the money they have borrowed. When I returned last year from England, I heard from various quarters, the above calumny repeated about my distressing the churches. In order to

get to the bottom of the matter, and to see whether there was any foundation for it, I wrote the following note to the gentleman who manages these things, and received his answer. Since that time, nothing has occurred respecting any of the churches, except the business as Perth.

MY DEAR SIR, *Edinburgh, Nov.* 16. 1808.

As unfavourable reports have been circulated respecting my conduct of late, to those to whom I had advanced money for places of worship, and as you have, for a considerable time, managed all these concerns, and are fully acquainted with them, I beg you will inform me distinctly of the transactions that have taken place in regard to these houses, during the present year; and also of the usual manner of proceeding in respect to them for some years past.

I am, &c.

Answer.

MY DEAR SIR, *Edinburgh, 19th Nov.* 1808.

In answer to your favour of 16th current, (since receipt of which, I have looked over the correspondence, and other papers relative to that business), I have to say, in point of fact:—

That with regard to the interest due to you, on the various sums lent to trustees for churches, there are but two or three cases where the interest has been regularly paid. Several have never paid any thing, and the others have paid partially; it not being convenient for them, as I suppose, to have done otherwise. At Whitsunday 1807, when almost the whole of these churches had got into a settled and organized state, I sent to each of them a state of the debt owing to you, carrying for-

ward the interest to that term. This was done, that those concerned might have in view the amount of the debts they severally owed, and that they might not allow the interest to run on unsettled. As it happens, this was not done at last Whitsunday, excepting in one case, (Musselburgh), where the loan was large, and a considerable sum of interest standing over unpaid. The application for the interest, was made verbally by me to one of the trustees; and although no payment followed, the application was not repeated.

That in no case have you ever demanded up any of these loans. A few months ago, a letter was sent me by Mr Hamilton of Armagh, proposing for the trustees to pay up the loan to the church there, and wishing to know how the mortgage was to be discharged. Mr Hamilton stated the reason of the application to be, the expence and inconvenience of remitting interest to Scotland. I answered, by suggesting to Mr Hamilton the propriety of consulting a solicitor at Armagh, in what way the discharge might be made out at the least expence. Since that time (June last) I have heard no more on the subject.

That there has not been a place of worship sold, which belongs wholly or in part to you, excepting only that at Haddington, in this neighbourhood, the property of which belonged to you and another. The church there is very small, not above twenty-four members, so far as I know. Owing to this, and the audience never being so large as nearly to fill the chapel, the pastor and some of the members were accustomed to speak of the house as not being suitable. Last spring, an application had, it seems, been made by a Presbyterian congregation to Mr Hill, the pastor of the church, to purchase the chapel. He wrote one of the proprietors*, in-

* At that time there were four proprietors.

forming him of the offer, when it was understood, from the way in which they had formerly spoken of the house, and Mr Hill forwarding that application, that the church had not the smallest objection to the chapel being sold. It was sold accordingly by the proprietors, who were careful not to give possession to the purchasers, till the church were accommodated with another place. This is the literal history of the sale, and of the circumstances that led to it.

I have only to add, that no change whatever in your conduct towards those churches to whom you had lent money, has ever taken place, so far as I know ; and I presume that you have done nothing in these matters, with which I am not acquainted.

I am, &c.

From what has been stated, it will be seen, that the report of my distressing the churches, 'is not true in 'any shape, or in one single instance.'

Since writing the greater part of the above, Mr Ewing has given up the Tabernacle. After the book he had published, such as, I believe, no other man, who professes to be a follower of Christ, would have done, it was impossible he could act otherwise. I am only astonished that he was so long of taking this step, or of informing me that he intended it.

He has also resigned his office as pastor. Whatever difference of opinion may have hitherto obtained, respecting the bond by which he held the Tabernacle, surely there can be none remaining now. The course he has followed, sufficiently proves what I have advanced, as to the connexion between the church and the house. How unscriptural a situation that was, in which the relation of a church and its pastor, or any of

its internal concerns, could be affected by the tenure of a house, I hope it is unnecessary now to shew.

I am extremely happy at his leaving the house. It breaks up an antichristian system, which I have reason to lament originated in my ignorance and that of those with whom I was acting, and which was powerfully exerting itself in opposition to the progress of truth. The renunciation of the bond, will put an end to those jarrings which, from the beginning, it occasioned. The source of those evils, however Mr Ewing may endeavour to gloss them over, and to lay them to my charge, may now, from his own account, be traced to that unfounded suspicion and jealousy to which he so early gave way, and which has caused so much trouble to us both. I have borne much from him, and I rejoice that this connexion, in which we were both removed from scriptural ground, is dissolved. It is now evident, that while leaving one establishment, we hastened to set up another; for every fundamental objection that can be brought against an established church, applied to this new arrangement, although in a different degree. Here also something was added to the religion of Jesus, institutions appointed by him were altered or superseded, and a stability was attempted to be given to the system, and an additional security provided for the fellowship of his people, from principles and sanctions entirely foreign to the nature of his spiritual kingdom. But God hath made foolish the wisdom of this world.

This error at the foundation wrought in every direction. When Mr Ewing went to Glasgow, some of the most enlightened Christians, suspecting that there was something unscriptural in the settlement of the house, were deterred from joining him. As light increased, the evil became more manifest. When another pastor was proposed, the arrangements, and the possession of

the house, were both pleaded by Mr Ewing against the measure. On that occasion he said, that no man could be in that house on the same footing that he was, the pulpit was his; that he once had a colleague, knew what it was to have one, but *he would never have another!* To the church he said, 'That he had already 'known what it was to have a colleague; that he had 'stated his mind on that subject to those that talked to 'him about it; that those who thought a plurality of 'elders indispensably requisite, could go to those in 'town who had a plurality.' After declaring his own sentiments on the subject, he concluded the matter thus: 'These are my sentiments, and if any are dissatisfied, 'they know my house, I am always at home, and acces-'sible, and we shall talk over the matter, and if after all 'they are not satisfied, they must just go away peace-'ably, if they cannot remain peaceably. THE HOUSE IS 'MINE; those that remain peaceably, may remain; and 'those that will not remain peaceably, must go away: 'peace we must have, and peace we will have.' Such was the manner in which his right to the house was exercised to keep the church in subjection; and this is the man who exclaims against patronage!

The evils it gave rise to in Mr Ewing's conduct, and that of the church, stirred up much dissension between them and the church in Albion street; and were the cause of *twelve objections* being formally proposed by a committee, appointed by the latter, against holding fellowship with him or his church. The dissatisfaction thus occasioned, is, I believe, still far from being done away; and some, I understand, will not yet attend the monthly prayer meetings of the two churches.

The unscriptural business of the assistants, was entirely the offspring of the bond. Mr Ewing may as-

sert, that the church was allowed to elect them, but from whatever cause it arose, even when they were dissatisfied with the choice he had made, they did not attempt to do so. On one occasion, some of his most confidential members, who wished a change of his assistant, but were afraid to speak to him, came to me on the business. Is Mr Ewing ignorant of the feeling complaints of another assistant, who declared, in letters to his friends, that his situation was extremely distressing; for when he was much dissatisfied with Mr Ewing's procedure in discipline, he knew he must be silent, or leave Glasgow, for he felt that he was completely in his power, and had no dependence on the church. He added, that when any of the members objected to Mr Ewing's measures, he told them, if they were not satisfied, to go elsewhere, and that many of them had taken the hint and gone to Mr Wardlaw's church. He likewise mentioned, that having employed a certain person to preach for him, Mr Ewing said, 'I will let 'you know that the pulpit is mine, and that before you 'put any person into it, you must ask my liberty.' To this system succeeded another likewise, in virtue of the bond, in which brethren belonging to their own body were paid a guinea, or half a guinea a-time, for teaching the church!

In speaking of the assistants, I am reminded of two most unjust observations which Mr Ewing has made on the accounts of the Tabernacle, page 246. They are repeated in a marginal note, and are brought forward a fourth time in the same page, in the total of the surplus paid, as if it was more than he was bound to account for. They contain a very injurious accusation against me, and are directly contrary to fact, as may be seen by turning to the letter by which he was authorized to employ an assistant, page 66. In connexion with

the statement there given, I am charged, page 171, and elsewhere, with 'cutting down the assistant's salary,' which is not true. Here, as in other cases, Mr Ewing's own documents sufficiently expose the incorrectness of his alleged facts. He ought on the contrary to have stated, that when applied to, to make up a deficiency in the funds, I yielded to the demand, although I knew that my compliance was entirely gratuitous.

After the house was finished, and delivered over to Mr Ewing, if any thing was wanted, especially to supply their teachers, it would surely have been more proper that the church should have been called on to provide it for themselves, than taught to look for it to me, while they were collecting for other places. He reminds me of the assistance they gave in this manner, to pay interest for my money lent on houses, without which the securities * on them would, he says, have been less valuable. From his account, that I have been 'adding thousand to thousand in the funds,' and that my securities on houses, have been in a measure guaranteed and rendered effectual by his exertions for years, the public will no doubt be prepared to hear of the magnitude of the fortune I have been amassing by Tabernacles, and of the ten per cent. which it has been all along said I have drawn from them. I shall afterwards state how many per cents I have received. When this is done, Mr Ewing's representations on this subject, will appear in their proper light. I suppose all the boasted exertions of the Glasgow Tabernacle, never produced to me as much from other houses, as would reimburse me for the price of its own collection boxes. Speaking of their con-

* From the remarks which Mr Ewing has made on securities for money lent on houses for worship, he seems to be unable to distinguish between them and his bond.

tributions to other houses, he says, 'In this way we 'have given much more than would buy the Taber- 'nacle, or build a better house.' It may be so; but it would require facts and documents of another sort, from those statements in his book, on which Mr Ewing has bestowed that name, to convince me, that they have given for this purpose, one fourth part of that sum.

Owing to his insinuations, that my declared intention respecting the application of the price of the Tabernacle, only referred to November 15. 1808, it becomes proper here to say, that according to my letter of that date, I shall 'apply, without delay, the price which I re- 'ceive from the property, in translating and multiply- 'ing copies of the Scriptures.' This I consider to be a lawful destination, entirely different from its former application. Having from circumstances been obliged publicly to state this intention, I shall publicly give an account, when it can be done, of the manner in which both principal and interest, have been applied.

On the whole, let the transaction of the bond be a warning to others who are desirous of promoting the diffusion of the gospel and reformation in the churches. When this great work is attempted, let it be undertaken with the full conviction of the spiritual nature of the kingdom of Jesus; of his wisdom as the great legislator, in appointing all that is necessary, and nothing that is superfluous for its prosperity, and of his power to accomplish his designs by the means which HE HATH INSTITUTED. But "vain man would be wise, though man be born like the wild ass's colt." He conceives that he can make some improvement, even in regard to that "mystery (now made manifest) which, from the beginning of the world, hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ, to the intent that now, unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places

might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." Something of man's devising must be added to the laws of Christ to give them effect, to adapt them to the times in which he lives, and to the varying circumstances of human nature. Those things which he deems to be *non-essential*, or *little* in themselves, must be taken away, at least may be safely omitted, and when they appear to run counter to prevailing prejudices, must on no account be regarded. Sanctions of a worldly nature must also be superinduced. Thus, where harmony and beauty are perfect, and every thing is divinely conducive to the most glorious ends, one thing is set at variance with another; the uniformity of the whole is disturbed; while men are taught to trifle with the authority of God, and unwarily to take from and to add to his words. This is ANTICHRIST, whether it appear in the councils of a Roman Pontiff, the plans of a German reformer, or the bonds and regulations of an independent church.

But here the question may be put, if Babylon, under the most monstrous forms, has survived for ages, how comes it that the bond of the Tabernacle, to which a character of equal malignity cannot be ascribed, has so speedily operated to its own destruction? The reason is this. The extent and duration of former unscriptural systems, have been proportioned to the predominancy of the worldly principles which they contained. In the system with which the latter is connected, the opposite qualities have been more equally poised. Combined with the stipulations of carnal wisdom, principles were admitted, which exclusively belonged to the spiritual kingdom—principles of real reformation. Without these, this arrangement might have lasted an age. But in its speedy termination,

our attention is directed to the fulfilling of the promised destruction of the man of sin, by the brightness of the coming of Jesus. As the period approaches, the work goes on with accelerated velocity. While at another time it would have taken a century, at present it has only required ten years to discover and explode much that was antichristian among us.

From a superficial view of all that has happened, the original plan of reformation, on which we commenced, may now appear to be entirely defeated; while in reality those changes which we have seen, are only the necessary advances to greater maturity. The sound principles which it contained, have begun to unfold and expand, and the whole has assumed a more scriptural form.

At a future period, I intend, if the Lord will, to advert more particularly to whatever seems worthy of notice in Mr Ewing's book. I consider myself to be called on from what he has advanced, to give a statement of the system on which my friends and I have been proceeding, and the reasons of our conduct. I shall particularly attend to what he has said of the classes, the sending out of the preachers by the Society for propagating the gospel at home, of the Missionary Magazine, and of his most unjust accusation, that clandestine measures have been pursued, and in short to whatever has not already been sufficiently noticed, and may seem of importance in that long catalogue of articles summed up at the end of Mr Ewing's book, which must appear to every one at all acquainted with the circumstances, rather like the language of a distempered mind, than the sober conclusions of a sound understanding. As, however, it may be some time before this is done, it may be proper

here to remark on what he has said of the Society for propagating the gospel at home, where he accuses them of improper conduct, in the case of a preacher to whom they gave only L. 20 in the course of a year. Mr N. M., the person alluded to, had been received by me into the class. But I made no stipulation with him, or with others, that they should receive support beyond the time they remained at it. It was expected of them, as they had received their education and subsistence gratuitously while at the class, that if the Society for propagating the gospel, chose to support them for the further period of one year, they should go out as preachers during that time under their directions. On the other hand, nothing was ever said to give them a claim to this, and any such arrangement, on the part of the Society, or on my part, was entirely optional. When the Society employed any preachers, they appointed their stations, or sent them out, and directed them to let the Society know when a suitable situation was found, and afterwards made inquiry, from time to time, respecting their proceedings. In the above instance, nothing of this kind was done. When N. M. left the class, he was not taken into the employment of the Society. I gave him, however, L. 5 beyond his allowance, and he was left to proceed as he chose. Some time afterwards, he applied to the Society, and requested assistance. This they were in use of giving occasionally, to preachers who applied to them. They sent him L. 5—they afterwards did so a second time. But nothing passed, either then or afterwards, to lead to the supposition, that his support had devolved on them. He came afterwards to Edinburgh, to request assistance to build a place of worship for a church, to which he mentioned, that he statedly preached. At that time, (January 30. and February 4.) L. 5 more

was given to him; but as he had thus, at different times, received assistance, he was told, that either the church to whom he preached should support him, or that he should do something to provide for himself. Nor was it supposed, that he would find this to be difficult, either as a teacher, or in his former employment, which was that of a country labourer. From the above, then, it appears, that if he had received half the sum that was paid to him, after leaving the class, or even nothing at all, there could have been no ground for complaint against the Society. If any circumstance, in the above case, has been forgot; or if any thing ever passed, which gave Mr N. M. a claim on them for further assistance; or if he can even say, that he has suffered through any mistake he may have fallen into, I am sure they would to this hour very readily make it up. Mr Ewing attempts to lessen the sum he received, by shewing that part of it was from me as an individual. It is strange how people will labour to misrepresent others. It was the constant practice of the Society in sending money to preachers, to inquire what they had received from other quarters, which I suppose is the manner of every other society. I was in the habit for years of stating what I had given in this way to the preachers, and in order to prevent confusion, such sums, when the payments were approved of, were entered in the books of the Society. These entries will there be found, to a great amount. When I first heard that the young man himself had mentioned only the one part of what he received, and not the other, I conceived he had done wrong, and had given an unfair account of the Society; as I thought what was so constantly practised and referred to in the payments of the preachers, was probably known to him; but from what I have since heard, I am satisfied that he had no bad design.

Throughout his book, Mr Ewing uses language to induce the belief, that the Society for propagating the gospel at home, and I, had pledged ourselves to afford perpetual assistance or support to those who had attended the classes. Nothing can be more unfounded; nor were they ever given to expect any thing of this kind. On the contrary, when he was speaking of the 'solemn declarations,' which he says they were called to subscribe, why has he not informed his readers, that in the letters which some of the earlier classes subscribed, they *solemnly declared*, that they considered it would be their duty, while they continued to preach the gospel, to work with their own hands, if necessary, for their support? Assistance, however, has been afforded to many for several years, which was never stipulated, nor in any way held out as intended to be so long continued. After a trial has been made at any place, where the church, among whom he labours, does not support the preacher, what should be done? Ought not he then to endeavour to provide for himself, as he was formerly accustomed to do? Many have a considerable time ago seen it to be their duty to act in this manner, and the probable necessity of it was long since anticipated, even at their entry to the classes, as is above noticed. Yet this recurrence, where necessary, to honourable industry—this imitation of apostolic example, and obedience to apostolic precept, is represented by Mr Ewing, as a greater distress brought upon a denomination of Christians, than has been endured since the days of persecution. I have contributed to the assistance of many of the preachers, in thus following their duty, which is so conducive to their own happiness, and to the furtherance of the gospel. I believe none of them have applied to me in vain, to assist to reinstate them in their former lines of employment when necessary, or to place them in others

for which they are now qualified, and which they prefer. Nor has difference of sentiment ever prevented me from affording this aid. I shall have occasion, however, afterwards, to advert to the above subjects. In the mean time, as far as they respect the Society for propagating the gospel at home, it may not be improper here to repeat the concluding sentence of the letter which they sent to Mr Ewing, and with which they closed their correspondence with him. 'We have been careful to 'fulfil any expectation justly formed, by all with whom 'we are connected; and if in any instance it could be 'shewn, that through neglect, or by mistake, we had 'withheld from any person his due, we would, on being 'convinced of it, most readily make it up.' The above might, I presume, be judged sufficient to satisfy every candid person.

In connexion with what he has said about the Society, Mr Ewing has informed the public, that a proposal was made to send some of the preachers to England, which appeared to him 'little better than a convenient 'way of sending them to starve, or at least to struggle 'with the greatest hardships, at a distance from their 'friends, who might have been more clamorous, if they 'had witnessed what was endured. I viewed (says he) 'the proposal in this light, because it was an avowed 'part of the plan to bear the preacher's expences to the 'place where he was destined to go, and when he arrived there, though he might not know one individual, 'nor have a single letter of recommendation, he was *to 'be left to Providence*, that is, he was to expect no more 'support from the friends who had turned him adrift.' This measure he fixes upon me. His charge is not true. They were not sent to starve, nor to struggle with the greatest hardships, for the purpose above mentioned; and it was not an avowed part of the plan,

that upon their arrival at the place of their destination, they were to receive no more support from the friends who had turned them adrift *. Here I am at a loss what to say. Mr Ewing's representations are beyond any thing I have ever known. How dreadful is such conduct! I had different motives for sending preachers to England from those which he ascribes to me. And as to the measure itself, I well knew, that it could not be carried into effect without great expence, which, except from conviction of duty to God, (for I was under no other obligation in the business), I would not have incurred. This measure cost me, in the course of last year alone, L. 706.

On this occasion, are the following words of Mr Burder, published by Mr Ewing †, too strong, or the appeal too solemn?—'An innocent man cannot but feel 'indignant, when he finds himself, with his fellow-la-'bourers, thus maligned; and honest resentment might 'vent itself in terms not very honourable to false ac-'cusers: but the religion of the meek and lowly Jesus 'forbids us to return evil for evil; and an apostle di-'rects us, from the example of an angel disputing with

* In one case, a preacher was sent to a place where there was a church, and friends, who it was known, would receive him kindly, and recommend him as a teacher of a school, which was his purpose in going to England, and it was not expected that he would need further assistance. In the other cases, the preachers who went were to be supported solely at my expence, till they got into situations to provide for themselves; and to this hour I continue to give them assistance as they need it. What Mr Ewing says of an unwarrantable dissolution of their connexions, and that the measure was resorted to because they could not be supported by the people in these connexions, is an assertion similar to the rest of his 'facts and documents.'

† See Missionary Magazine 1799, p. 298.

a malignant enemy, not to bring a railing accusation, but to say, "The Lord rebuke thee."

After the manner in which Mr Ewing has behaved, it may be reckoned unnecessary, if not dishonourable, for me to answer him if he should write again. I am ready, however, to meet him on all the subjects between him and me; and if health be spared, to reply to whatever he may bring forward. I have no reason to be afraid of any thing he can say. I have the testimony of my conscience to rectitude of intention throughout, which, after all that he will ever be able to advance, it will be out of his power to shake, and of which, I doubt not, I can bring sufficient evidence to satisfy others. Hitherto he has misrepresented every thing. All is distorted, unfounded, or partially stated. Although not in his power to prove his assertions, he repeats them again and again. This is the case respecting the bond. He has not been able fairly to meet what I have said on that subject, or to shew that it was a proper and valid transaction in the kingdom of Christ. He cannot be ignorant, that many Christians view it in the same light that I do. Yet, always begging the question whenever his subject allows him to introduce it, he speaks as if I had broken faith with him*. How unfair and uncandid this is, need not be told; yet it is calculated to have an insensible effect on his readers, and to bring that odium upon his opponent after which he constantly labours. It is the same in regard to my motives. And here his efforts may be the more successful, because no one but myself can fully discover the extent of the guilt he has incurred. Every where he attaches the worst motives to every part of my conduct. But if it be a truth, that with what measure men mete, it

* Failing to attach to me one character, he fixes on himself another, which stands next to it in the word of God, 2 Tim iii. 3.

shall be measured to them again, he will afterwards have cause deeply to lament the rashness and criminality of his conduct.

It is easy for me to answer every part of Mr Ewing's book. The task, however, I feel, is not only irksome, but degrading. I fear too lest I be infected with the same spirit which his performance breathes, so unlike to the mind of Christ. He has departed far from the character of a fair* and honourable opponent, both in his present and former publication on church-government. In both, Christianity itself seems to be nearly out of the question. His first book proceeds on principles adapted to the carnality of the human mind. Witness his reasonings upon a plurality of elders. This is entirely different from the manner of Jesus and his apostles. Even in his own letters, which in his last publication he has selected to bring forward, the principle of pride is appealed to, and the maxims of the world adduced as proper for him and me to act on in the service of the gospel. In reasoning on the subject of the amount of his salary for the class, he says, 'When a reduction is to be

* In Mr Ewing's Animadversions on Mr Robertson, p. 21. he points out a note of Mr Robertson's, on which he remarks, that 'in 'all the volumes of the Missionary Magazine, it will be difficult to 'collect as much shifting and craft as are concentrated in the single 'note before us.' In his book on Church Government, p. 83. after quoting from Acts xx. 28. these words, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers," he says, "Some render the last word "bishops," but that makes no difficulty; for as the word deacon 'is often used where the ordinary office which has got that name 'is not intended, so may the word bishops be used here without 'signifying the ordinary office of the bishop." 'Some' not all, but *some*—'but that makes no difficulty!!' Is there any thing like this in all Mr Robertson's pamphlet? Did the man who wrote this feel no difficulty?

'made in any establishment, it is perhaps a maxim of 'general prudence that new people should be employ-'ed *.' Had I perceived at that time what this sentence so clearly discovers to me now, I would have called his attention to this subject before I had gone one step further. I would have told him, that, however current such maxims may be in the world, and however prudent and useful, owing to the hardness of men's hearts they may be deemed, they are inadmissible as the regulating principles of our conduct in the fellowship of the gospel: and are sufficient to mar and render abortive every endeavour we may make towards the extension of the kingdom of Christ. No; it is not in this way that he will be served. When we attempt it, we know not what spirit we are of. The edifice built on such a foundation, must belong, not to Christ, but to Belial. The same principle appears again in another shape, in his memorial concerning a theological academy; and I am happy to see that I have adverted to it in my answer, dated February 1804.

In publishing his letters and mine, although he has entirely failed in his main object of fixing the guilt of insincerity and of covetousness on me, he has made a humbling display of his own extreme ignorance and mine, of the nature of Christ's spiritual kingdom. They discover that we needed to be taught, what are the first principles of the oracles of God. Mr Ewing, and hundreds of Christians, will preach and pray together, will regularly and socially celebrate the resurrection of Christ, but because a house is not permanently secured to them in the way they wish, they will not commemorate his dying love for a twelvemonth, nor even call themselves a church. All this time, he and I are disputing about the nature of the bond by which it should be held. Every thing

* P. 74.

must be done between us by civil contracts, by legal obligation. We will not yield to one another, no, not an inch. If you suppose I am at all indebted to you, I tell you I am not. What I receive from you shall be on the footing of right, or I will not have it at all, and the work may stand still. These are the terms on which we must meet. "It shall not be so among you," said Jesus; yet the unseemly strife of the disciples, when they disputed by the way, who shall be greatest, was renewed between us. Ah! if in the midst of our long discussions which Mr Ewing notices, and which I have no doubt were very sinful, we had listened to the words of him who leaned on Jesus' bosom, "Little children, love one another:" if we had remarked and *imitated* the manner in which he who was not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles, addressed Philemon, his dearly beloved brother and fellow-labourer, "*Wherefore, though I might be much bold in Christ, to enjoin thee that which is convenient, yet, for love's sake, I rather beseech thee, being such an one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ:*"—had we proceeded thus, all had been well. We should not at this hour have been mutually accusing and counteracting one another. We should have been an example to believers, and mutual helpers of each other's joy. Yet, "if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." May the Lord grant unto him and me, that we may find mercy of the Lord in that day.

I am every day more persuaded, that the present is a state of much retribution. Trouble springeth not out of the ground; but I believe that the children of God suffer for their sins more certainly and constantly than other men. They meet with many things for the destruction of the flesh, which perhaps others escape; yet

it is to the end that their souls may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. Thus the saying of Jesus is verified: "In the world ye shall have tribulation." They fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ. As sons, they are all partakers of chastisement, that they may be partakers of their Father's holiness. How just, how gracious is the appointment! Thus we learn the dreadful and malignant nature of sin; and that it is the wise, the irrevocable decree of God, that under his righteous government, every thing shall meet its due recompense. Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished. This reminds us of the awful curse of the broken law. We feel that we are sinners. All of us have incurred the tremendous penalty, and if vengeance overtake us, we cannot dispute the just award. But mercy points to the cross of Christ. Jesus hath finished transgression, made an end of sins, made reconciliation for iniquity, and hath brought in everlasting righteousness. Great indeed is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh. Christ crucified is unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, he is the power of God, and the wisdom of God.

In the wonderful transaction of the cross of Christ, there is every thing both to humble and to console. The love and mercy of God are fully displayed; while his invariable opposition to sin, and determination to punish it, are there discovered in a light in which they will never be read by the glare of that eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels. By the resurrection of our Lord from the dead, the work is declared to be finished, the sacrifice accepted, and he is determined to be the Son of God with power. Here is the secure foundation on which every man stands, who has fled

for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us. Discovering this truth, and at the same time being made sensible of our condition as guilty sinners, in the language of the apostle we exclaim, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Correspondence with Mr Harley.

From Mr Harley.

MY DEAR SIR, *Glasgow, Aug.* 17. 1808.

WHEN I look back upon the first meeting I had with Mr Ewing and you, and the happy season that succeeded, when, by united zeal and talents, the gospel was preached to thousands who never heard it before; and when I compare these days with the present state of things, I am grieved to the heart.—"How is the gold become dim, and the most fine gold changed!" Methinks the streets and highways, where sinners were called and converted by the gospel, will witness against the present indifference to the conversion of sinners, and the zeal manifested for those things which gender strife, rather than godly edifying.

It gave me much concern to hear the disagreeable meeting you had with Mr Ewing last time you was here. I do not wish to enter into the merits of the misunderstanding between you, but cannot help regretting that you should have told him you conceived he had no right now to retain the Tabernacle. This led Mr Ewing, with the concurrence of his friends, to take legal advice about the validity of the tack. Many, both here and in Edinburgh, feel much interested in his behalf; and, as far as I can learn, there is but one opinion upon the subject, namely, that the tack is good, consistent both with law and equity, and that it is the duty of Mr Ewing to hold it for the purposes therein specified; the more so, as the relinquishing of it might

be injurious to the spread of the gospel. Were it now at your disposal, it is thought it would soon be turned to another purpose. Indeed, upon your principles, there could be no need for such a house. I cannot therefore conceive for what purpose you wished Mr Ewing to give it up, unless you intended to sell the property in order to apply the proceeds otherwise.

I must here remark, that it was surely very impolitic in you to make such a demand, as it will very much hurt the funds of the house. There is now such a prejudice against you and your measures, that I am afraid there will be a shortcoming, instead of a surplus. I hope you will excuse me for being so free and faithful.

As matters stand, it occurs to me, that the best way to settle the business would be for you to sell the house for behoof of the church, provided they should be able and willing to make the purchase; but the present state of trade and manufacture in this city is much against such a transaction.

The size of the house is also a bar in the way. If Mr E. were removed, I am afraid the congregation would dwindle away, and it would be a heavy burden upon the church.

However, if you think well of this proposal, you might mention the price and the terms of payment, &c. and I will let you know as soon as I can if there is any probability of our being able to make the purchase. I know some will object on this ground, that we are sure of accommodation during Mr Ewing's incumbency, and if he were leaving us, we could not wish such a large house, &c.

In valuing the property, you will no doubt deduct what to you seems the value of the lease, and the balance could be the sum paid you.

I have thought it my duty to write you; you may send an answer or not as you think fit. I hope Mrs Haldane is well. I have a sincere regard for you both; but I am truly sorry that I cannot, as formerly, wish you God speed.

I am, dear Sir,

Your's truly,

W. HARLEY.

To Mr Harley.

MY DEAR SIR, *London, Sept.* 9. 1808.

I RECEIVED your letter of the 17th ult. in consequence of which I have written to Mr Ewing. It is unnecessary to repeat what I have said to him respecting the Tabernacle. The original transaction, when fully considered, sufficiently speaks for itself. If you hesitate for a moment in regard to the impropriety of it, I ask if you would yourself deliberately repeat such an act. I can venture to say you would not. But there are other circumstances now connected with it, which of themselves decide the matter, and render it impossible that any man could desire to take a legal advantage, or to attempt to enforce possession in such a situation.

You observe in your letter, that many, both in Edinburgh and Glasgow, feel much interested in Mr Ewing's behalf. Is he then to be viewed as an object of compassion in this business? Has he in equity any further claim upon me, or has he not yet derived sufficient advantage in the free possession of the house for ten years? Did he give up any thing for it, or convey any value

in exchange? Was he obliged to keep it a single day, if he had seen or chosen any thing which he would have preferred? Whatever was his feeling towards me formerly, is it his wish, as matters now stand, to be always obliged to me for a gratuitous possession? I cannot suppose this to be the case. Nor can it with propriety be viewed as a hardship, if I state my expectation that he and his friends will now provide for themselves. When he shews the incongruity of the churches in not taking upon themselves the support of their seminaries, I have a right to expect that, paying a due regard to consistency, he will extend this principle to all their other concerns, and of course restore possession of this house. Would a line of conduct opposite to this discover that independence of spirit of which he speaks; or would it not rather be a specious arrangement of giving and taking, endeavouring to make the churches appear to be supporting themselves, while in reality they were living upon another? Inconsistency apart, the aukwardness of the situation would be manifest to every one acquainted with the circumstances. "The rottenness of the whole scheme" would soon be obvious. It is written, that it is "more blessed to give than to receive;" but we no where read of the blessedness of giving and receiving at the same time.

But are you and Mr Ewing's other friends so entirely destitute of what is necessary for the support of yourselves and your system as to render it impossible, or do you only want the inclination? Here, my dear Sir, allow me to speak to you personally. In your letter to me, you write with much approbation of what took place at the beginning of our acquaintance, through the application of my property. Since that time your business has abundantly prospered. You have confessedly succeeded in your worldly concerns beyond many. You

have been adding field to field, and have discovered new and unexpected sources of emolument. You have even enjoyed such a degree of superfluity, as to enable you to embellish your grounds with decorations that are useless although ornamental. But what great exertions have you made in the way of which you profess so much to approve? I do not press this inquiry further, and perhaps you could answer it very satisfactorily; but allow me to remind you, that our first duty in the application of property, in religion, as well as in every thing else, undoubtedly consists in *providing for ourselves*. Would it then have been too much to have expected, that before this time you would have proposed to assist in taking the Tabernacle at Glasgow off my hands, not only to assist in enabling me to support the great expences you knew I was incurring in the same cause in other places, but also to bear your own part of the burden, especially as you had been so long receiving my aid? If however this was not done, could I for a moment suppose, that when circumstances are so far altered, and our connexion is broken, you would hesitate to restore the house to me at once, with thankfulness for the past; or is it possible to conceive that you would applaud the resolution to retain it by force? Are you afraid, as you intimate, that if my talents were restored I would pervert them? The consideration of this is not the principle on which you are called to act. We are not to do evil to prevent evil, more than in order that good may come. And duty to the Lord neither requires nor admits, that you should take advantage of any mistake, or that you should offer as a sacrifice the property of another, brought under your power by an unlawful alienation. The bond by which the house is held being manifestly opposed in its nature and principles to the kingdom of Christ, is, in a religious point

of view, null and void; just as a civil bond would be if contrary to the laws of the land, or as Mr Ewing now deems a solemn subscription of the formulary of the church of Scotland. Were any advantage then to be taken of it, in what light ought such conduct to be viewed? or could any satisfaction be looked for in the unpleasant connexion in which we should afterwards stand? Might not various evils be anticipated? and can you possibly suppose, that by such a state of things, the interests of the gospel could be promoted?

You judge that what I have said to Mr Ewing is very impolitic in regard to the surplus. But my object in the business, as I have told him, is not pecuniary reimbursement. You will recollect, however, that although hitherto not demanded, the bond requires, that the whole of the collections at the Tabernacle shall be accounted for, in the way it specifies, without any exception of what is made exclusively by the church. Even this surplus, like every thing else belonging to the bond, stands upon an improper footing. Indeed the whole of the way in which the money-matters of the house were settled, is not only wrong in itself, but has given extensive currency to very unpleasant surmises. It has been reported, that instead of the Tabernacles at Glasgow, Dundee and Edinburgh being an expence to me, I derived from them a revenue of ten per cent. interest. The manner too in which the house was conveyed to Mr Ewing, has strengthened the opinion which has existed, and been propagated, that his leaving the established church was not so much owing to his conscience being affected, as to his yielding to other motives and circumstances connected with his former situation.

In making your proposal to me about the purchase of the house, you think that some will object to it on the

ground that you are sure of accommodation, during Mr Ewing's incumbency. Setting entirely out of view the nature of that footing on which it would in future be held, such as I suppose would be different from that on which any other house for worship is held in Britain, or from what any man or church would choose to hold one; where is your security for the continuance of this accommodation? You know it is possessed by you at Mr Ewing's pleasure. Your situation may prove a snare, and you may be led to acquiesce where you ought to oppose, and to approve where you ought to condemn. For the very purpose of creating an authority over the church, the bond was conceived in the terms in which it runs; and for the very same purpose, the manner in which the choice of the assistant is regulated, was afterwards fixed. And is there no danger in your circumstances? In another situation, could you have allowed mutual exhortation in the church, which you had been taught was an institution of Christ, to be set aside without the most public, the most solemn and deliberate inquiry? Could you have permitted your discipline to grow so remiss, that the grand rule Matth. xviii. 15. should be disregarded, and that your pastor should not be on speaking terms with one who bears office in the other church in Glasgow, with which you are closely united, and in which he occasionally presides in the worship *? and could you have allowed yourselves to be

* In a note on this place, Mr Ewing says, Matthew xviii. 15. was not disregarded. If so, the precept has only been partially attended to, for the offence, I am informed, still remains. Let Matthew xviii. 15, 16, 17. be regarded, and the evil will be done away from the churches. We may rest assured, that the failure has not been owing to any defect in the law. I ask then again, what shall be thought of two churches, some of whose office-bearers are not on speaking terms? What kind of Christianity is

disunited from another church, in the manner in which this has lately taken place? It is now a very common opinion, that the discipline and state of your church require reformation. These things ought to be considered for your own sake as well as for Mr Ewing's.

In fixing the sum I should require as the price of the house, you suppose that I will no doubt deduct the value of the lease. I have noticed this already in my letter to Mr Ewing on the subject. I think you should have viewed the matter in another light. But on what ground do you speak of the bond as a *lease*, or a *tack* as you elsewhere call it? Although these words may be used in the bond, this tenure is not entitled to such an appellation. In forming your ideas on the subject, you should always recollect that nothing in the way of restipulation for possession of the house was given, or conceded, on account of which it might deserve the name of a lease.

You speak in your letter of the present indifference to the conversion of sinners. As you no doubt applied this observation to the person to whom you was writing, I am entitled to answer for myself, and to say that

here exhibited to the world? What do people mean, when they talk of 'usefulness,' and 'spheres of usefulness,' while they set aside among themselves the law of God, and make it of none effect? There is not a more fundamental principle in the kingdom of Jesus Christ, than that his subjects shall live in peace, and that when offences occur among them, they shall be settled according to his explicit commandment. Reconciliation must take place, or the party which holds out must be excluded from a name among his subjects. What sort of fellowship in the gospel does it suppose, when an open violation of the law is winked at? Yet here are two churches deliberately neglecting this rule. To spare an offender, they are resting under the guilt of presumptuous sin. Their communion is defiled, and they make all others, who have fellowship with them, partakers of their sins.

it is not a fact. I have nothing to boast of; but I may be allowed to compare my present and my former sentiments and conduct, and when you compliment the one at the expence of the other, to tell you that your judgment in the case is altogether unfounded. As however you have attempted no proof of what you assert, I need advance no refutation. I would only remind you of these words, "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." You also lament that zeal is manifested for those things, which, you say, gender strife rather than godly edifying. What are those things? Are they the inquiries that have been agitated concerning the commands and institutions of Christ? But have not the Scriptures been appealed to for what has been advanced? You cannot have forgotten the reverberation of this very cry when you left the church of Scotland, the language of the Pastoral Admonition, and the constant accusations against us all for the course we at that time pursued. We thought a reformation was necessary. We were persuaded that the people of God were bound up by unscriptural laws, and that churches of Christ ought exclusively to consist of believers in his name. Yet you remember how much strife this last principle gendered, and how much the measures pursued were represented as at variance with peace, and love, and every thing in which the essential principles of Christianity are concerned. Did we therefore desist in our inquiries, or stop short in our progress? And ought we now to be afraid of the question, what saith the Scriptures, and of the consequent effects, because this cry is again raised among ourselves? When we came out of the church of Scotland, every thing was not attained or perfected. It was therefore duty to go forward in the same direction in which we were proceeding: and, disregarding the tra-

ditions, whether originating among ourselves, or received from others, that appeared contrary to it, to regulate all things by the word of God.

I believe that almost every thing which has of late been urged in opposition to these inquiries, was formerly said on your leaving the establishment. Faults on both occasions have no doubt been discerned; but I am fully convinced, that the general strain of opposition has in both proceeded on the same principle. In every attempt at reform, the truth of our Lord's declaration, that he came to bring fire on the earth, has been evinced. The constant and unvarying opposition of the world fully proves it; and it is a lamentable fact, that truth is opposed by the disciples themselves with equal steadiness, and almost with equal violence, in as far as it reaches beyond the limits of what they have already received. Yet none of the commandments or institutions of Jesus are calculated to produce strife, but all of them are adapted for godly edifying. Indeed the more they are received and obeyed, the more will their salutary effects be experienced. When at any time however they are proposed to our notice, it is true that with the world we may find occasion for stumbling; and we may also discover in our brethren, as the world does in every Christian, what may justly be blamed; but we ought to be much on our guard, lest on account of such things we should at any time reject the truth of God. I am sorry that you should repeat such assertions as you have made. Are you sure that you do no injustice when you so speak, and that you are not in some instances opposing what you have not properly inquired into, or do not fully understand? In preferring charges against others, proof should be given, and great caution exercised. I trust however you will shew a better speci-

men of your zeal than your letter affords. The spirit of Christianity will be more surely evinced, by cheerfully ministering of your own substance, than by attempting to force into the service a contribution from your neighbour, whether you may allege that you do it in order to effect real good, or to hinder him from perverting it to positive evil.

You observe, that there now exists a strong prejudice against me and my measures; and in this I am fully persuaded you say the truth. Let me remind you again of the prejudice that existed against both, when I left the church of Scotland. The latter I believe made no impression on you, and I trust that I shall not be moved by the former. The prejudice however, you will say, now exists among a different set of people, and these are good people, whose partiality and esteem I formerly enjoyed. But were there no good people among the others, and had I no share in their favour, when first I professed to obey the truth? The apostles met with opposition, not only from the world, but also from the churches they had gathered. "We are fools," says Paul to the Corinthian believers, "but ye are wise." With prejudices from different quarters I lay my account, while I certainly ought to be careful that they be not well founded. I am firmly persuaded, however, that if enabled closely to follow Paul as he followed Christ, instead of this prejudice being diminished, it will be proportionably increased. I have long been convinced, that if I wished to acquire or to secure popularity and influence, it would have been necessary to have followed a different course from that which I have held. As it respects you, my dear Sir, I entreat you to be careful by what criterion you judge. Be careful, on the present occasion, to do what is right. In regard to the bond, which has been the cause of our correspondence, the evil of its being given or accepted,

was very early discovered by some of our friends. I offered such a one to another, who did not hesitate for a moment to reject it. He declined having any thing bound about such a business. Time has thrown much light on the unscriptural nature of this transaction, and whatever may be supposed, I believe it will soon have very few advocates; and that it will even be matter of astonishment, that ever it should have been thought of at the beginning of a professed reformation of religion. Let Mr Ewing continue to act upon it, and I shall wish to know the principles on which he left Lady Glenorchy's Chapel. If he can prove that the one is in Babylon, and that it was his duty to leave it, I am certain he will never be able to defend the other.

It is exceedingly unpleasant to be compelled to write to you as I have done. You may rest assured that I am actuated by no spirit of dislike to you, or Mr Ewing, or to the church with which you are connected. As you appear to me to be in many respects opposing the truth, I wish to be entirely freed from the connection in which we must stand as long as you retain the house you occupy on its present footing, during which time, as a church, you would be deriving from me the principal support of yourselves and your system. I mentioned to Mr Ewing, that I supposed it would appear most advisable for you to build a new house; but if you prefer purchasing the Tabernacle, I should have no objections, as I have intimated to him, to treat with you concerning it, as soon as our present connection in it is at an end. At the close of your letter, you express your sincere regard for me, which I assure you I do not in the smallest degree doubt. Be assured I feel the same for you. I am extremely sorry that any difference of opinion should subsist between us. I beg you will remember me very kindly to Mrs Harley; and that you will believe me to be,

My dear Sir, &c.

To Mr Harley.

MY DEAR SIR, *Edinburgh, Sept.* 22. 1808.

SINCE writing to Mr Ewing and to you, in answer to your letter of the 17th ult. it has occurred to me, that lest I should appear to be standing on any punctilio in the business between us, which is far from being my design, I should have mentioned, as you desired, the price for which I am willing to sell the house. And if you resolve to purchase it, further discussion respecting the bond will thus be prevented, which is certainly very desirable.

I would therefore now say, that I am ready to sell the house for what it has cost me, allowing the price if you choose, to be paid by instalments, in a reasonable way, as might afterwards be settled. Excepting the money originally paid for the Circus, the whole I believe has gone through your hands, so that you know there has been no unnecessary expenditure. It is impossible, I should think, that any one could propose, or even desire other terms. The whole was laid out purposely for the object to which it has been applied, and you have been hitherto reaping the benefit of it.

The Tabernacle at Glasgow is now the only house that is held in the manner described in the bond, a mode of tenure which, as henceforth it can neither be honourable nor comfortable to any of the parties concerned, will, I hope, soon be superseded in some way agreeable to us all.

I am, my dear Sir, &c.

THE FOLLOWING IS THE PAPER REFERRED TO BY MR EWING, WHICH WAS SHEWN TO THE STUDENTS AND OTHERS.

I AM persuaded that we have not yet attained the best method of spreading the gospel. Our exertions appear to depend almost entirely on the building of houses, and the education of preachers. While these, if kept in a proper place, may continue, I presume, to be highly useful and subservient to the work, surely they ought not to limit its extension. Do we read of the apostles being confined in their endeavours for want of such means? When they went to a place, and so preached that some believed, was there a great struggle made, first to build a large house, and then to bring pastors from a distance? We hear of no difficulties on these heads. By our adopting this method, we form a kind of union between the church and the world; for having incurred debt to build a large house, and having undertaken prematurely to maintain a preacher, the aid of the world must be called in to support this establishment; and so a most powerful temptation is held out to the preacher and the church to be unfaithful in various ways.

But, to be more particular; after disciples are found in any place, the first error appears to be their delaying to unite as a church of Christ. They defer this for several reasons. They wait perhaps till there be a number of them so considerable as to give *respectability* to the cause; next they delay till they obtain a preacher by profession, from a distance; and afterwards, till they see whether they are able to retain him among them,

by providing for his support. Further, it is often considered necessary to defer their union, until they shall have obtained means to build a meeting-house, or perhaps till one is actually built. During this interval, they form themselves into some kind of association of human devising, which is generally the source of many subsequent evils. These are of different kinds, arising sometimes from a more loose plan of admission of members than can afterwards take place, which lays the foundation of violent animosities, and often, from an unwise and premature discussion, in an abstract manner, of their future duty. In short, they are now exposed to many dangers, which must always happen when the flock is wandering from the shepherd's tents.

Their next step, if they survive the danger of their former situation, is, after long delay, to unite together as a church. Still however they are far from a settled state. They have no idea of looking to the Lord for elders from among themselves; they must therefore continue to depend entirely on preachers from a distance. A preacher comes, or has been for some time among them; but they are not pleased with him: he must therefore retire, and the work is to begin anew. Another is sent, and again another, which has a great tendency to divide the brethren, and often does so; especially as from certain considerations, not always the purest, it is as necessary that worldly hearers should be pleased as themselves. At length however, it may be, they are satisfied. Then they very earnestly desire to have the preacher settled with them. But he, perhaps, has not made up his mind, and another long period elapses before this takes place. During all this time, the brethren are in a very loose disjointed state. They have the name of a church, it is true; but they are

very far from enjoying the advantages and security which the Lord by that ordinance has provided. Continuing long without pastors, the want is severely felt in different ways. Much confusion in the mean time often ensues, and wrong sentiments and principles are embraced and acted on, which afterwards it becomes very difficult to eradicate. Besides, they often conclude, that until they have pastors ordained among them, they have not a right to observe the Lord's supper; and thus they lose the benefit of this most useful and delightful ordinance, which is so much calculated to cement their union, and increase their faith. It is easy to perceive how ruinous all this must be—how hurtful to Christians and the world—how obstructive to the diffusion of the gospel, and the maintenance of its purity. Yet you well know, that many connected with us have continued in the situations I have above described, for two, three, or four years, and some continue in one or other of them to this day. By these means, many who at first appeared to run well, are hindered. Several of them, after a while, fall away, and go back to the world; and others, entirely discouraged by the attempt they have made, return to the unscriptural connections from which they have separated.

The most perfect state to which the churches have yet attained, falls now to be considered. Here again it appears there are many deficiencies. An order has been adopted on the Lord's day, that is very far from being scriptural. That day is consecrated to the memory of the resurrection of Jesus our Lord, and for the meeting of the saints, in order that they may hold fellowship with him and with each other, in the observance of every social ordinance. Through the whole of the day, however, one man alone is employed as the speaker, and the fellowship of the church is not at all exhibited, ei-

ther to itself or the world, except in one ordinance, and that put as it were in the back ground, after the world is informed, by the manner of conducting the service, that they have no occasion to remain any longer present. The very important ordinances of prayer and exhortation by the brethren, and of discipline, are thus excluded altogether from the first day of the week. These however are acknowledged by the churches as social ordinances, and are observed on a week-day in the *church meeting*, as it is exclusively denominated; which, from different circumstances, is attended but partially by the disciples, and by a very small number from the world. These last are even shut out from witnessing the discipline of the church, in its various exercises of receiving, reproving, or putting away members, duties which are highly calculated to carry conviction, and to convey instruction to their minds. Many evils arise out of this unauthorized arrangement. These ordinances being put out of their place, several mistakes are occasioned regarding them. Prayer and exhortation by the brethren are considered as an improper waste of the Lord's day, and discipline as not sufficiently holy for it. Thus they are set as much below their proper level, as the Lord's supper when made the only exhibition of the fellowship of the church, when the whole are come together, is raised above it. Neither is that improvement made in them that ought to be, nor that advantage to all the members derived from them which is intended. From the above order, by the unequal means of instruction afforded to the church, a foundation of schism is often laid; while the obtaining of pastors from the churches themselves, is rendered almost totally impracticable, and the doctrine of the necessity of a plurality in each church, becomes a mere speculation. On the whole, a method has been adopted on the Lord's day, not pointed out by the word of God,

but devised by human systems—a mode in which all depends on the qualifications of one man, and in which every thing goes on well, independently of the state of the church, be that what it may. This perfectly suits a worldly society. It is equally fitted for all established churches. It is, in fact, practised by the church of Rome, the church of England, and the church of Scotland. But is it possible that, constituted as these are, even the outward form of Christ's spiritual kingdom can be adapted to them? In fact, it is not. Let them, in their assemblies, attempt to adopt scriptural order, calling on their members to exhort, and publicly following out the rules of discipline in all its parts, and they would immediately be dissolved. As it is impossible that *they* should exhibit Christ's kingdom in the world, how great a loss is sustained when his body, the churches of the saints, fail in this respect to hold forth the word of life. But when these shall walk in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless, they will do more to bring the insulated and erring followers of Jesus out of Babylon, and into the fellowship of the gospel, than by all the reasonings that can be used on the subject; and by the same means, they will do more for the conversion of the world than all the missionary societies that could be instituted.

I shall now state what appears to me to be the scriptural mode of association, which is calculated both for the propagation and permanency of the gospel in its purity.

When there is one believer in any place, he must of course act as an individual. But when there are more than one, association is attainable, and therefore duty. Wherever there are two or three disciples, they should meet in Christ's name, and he will be in the midst of them. Here is a church. For what is a church, but

association and fellowship in the gospel, of which, in the New Testament, we read of one kind only? The word *church*, which we use exclusively in religious matters, tends very much to mislead us on this subject. We are apt to annex to it something mysterious, as is done to some of the other ordinances. This is a most unhappy effect of introducing technical language into religion, of which our translation of the Scriptures is full, and which is one of the worst things belonging to it. Yet this was done intentionally, according to the instructions given to the translators, which, in so far, were completely popish. Such a style however is quite contrary to the manner of the apostles, as they appear uniformly to have used words in their common acceptation. To have done otherwise, would have been degrading the subject. The service of God which interests men of all ages, professions, and different degrees of cultivation of mind, ought not to be perplexed by terms of art. But how many of these are found in our English translation! We have *church*, *ordination*, *preaching*, *gospel*, *ministration*, &c. Read the third chapter of 2 Corinthians, and observe what a veil the use of the word *ministration*, instead of *service*, throws over, not only that chapter, but the whole train of the apostle's argument. You will scarcely ask a single person the meaning of the term, ministration of the Spirit, who will not prove by his answer that he has mistaken it. I mention this, to shew how much this language is calculated to mislead. In common discourse on religious subjects we have added to the list of these words which are so general, and we are so much accustomed to them, that it is very difficult to express ourselves otherwise, and to get rid of the language of *systematic divinity*. We speak, for instance, of *forming* a church. The Scriptures do not use this language. We there read of

disciples meeting together, and this, we find, is what the apostles mean when they speak of a church, Acts i. 15. compared with Acts ii. 47.; Acts xi. ver. 21. with ver. 26. We neither read in the Scriptures of any ceremony in forming a church, nor of any *previous* or *preparatory* association, such as a prayer-meeting. The Lord has given uniform rules for his people in association, which become obligatory the moment they are practicable. For instance, wherever there are two disciples, they can meet in his name, with Him in the midst of them, to observe all the social ordinances, as prayer, praise, reading, mutual exhortation, and the fellowship if necessary, shewing forth his death, receiving additions to their number, or turning away from each other. When their numbers increase, the choice of elders and deacons becomes practicable and necessary, and as soon as they are able to support those who labour in word and doctrine, that also becomes a duty. In this way they at first proceeded. The meeting of disciples at Jerusalem was, as far as it had gone, complete at the beginning, although the nature of the association required additions in its progress, an instance of which we have in the appointment of deacons, "*when the number of the disciples was multiplied*," Acts vi. 1. In the same way, we read of the appointment of elders by Paul and Barnabas, on their return through those cities, where, in consequence of their preaching in going forth, associations of believers had taken place. By that time, the character and gifts of the members would be known to each other, so that men could be appointed, who possessed the qualifications for the office required by the Scriptures, and who had *also* been proved, 1 Tim. iii.

The principal objection to what is said above, may appear to be the fixing on so small a number for association as two. But let it be remembered, that the

Lord specifies this number as sufficient for *social* worship, and that wherever two meet together, there is as really association as where there are more; and any larger number, to whatever extent, can only make a difference in degree. Tertullian, who wrote one century after the apostles, says that *three* constitute a church. This proves what were their ideas at that early period, in regard to the small number necessary for this. The number three, however, is certainly arbitrary, which indeed must be the case if we fix on any number beyond two. Calculations have been made of how many it required to be a church, drawn from the consideration of the steps to be taken in case of offence noticed by our Lord, Matt. xviii. 15. But this manner of interpreting such a passage, evidently tends to mislead. It was proper, in giving a general rule, to adapt it to the general and most complete state of the association of his people. The rule is applicable whenever it is practicable, just as that declaration is which is contained in the 19th verse, and the principle may be acted on, even where there are but two persons. On the whole, if we attend to the proper meaning of the word church, as used in Scripture, we shall be freed from our difficulties on this subject. It is used to denote merely a plurality of persons, of whatever description, whether believers or unbelievers; and to what extent as to number, we are left to gather from the context; and the words multitude, disciples, saints, &c. are often used along with it, as convertible terms.

In regard to their manner of worship, if not perverted at the beginning by the false teaching of human traditions, the disciples will diligently search the Scriptures, in order to regulate all their movements. They will perceive that the Bible, when left to speak for itself, is a very plain and intelligible book. They will attend to the

manner in which it teaches, sometimes by precept, and sometimes by example. But in whatever way they gather the mind of the Spirit, they will consider themselves equally bound by it. I presume it will not be difficult to ascertain what follows in regard to their worship. The Lord has appointed certain social ordinances, and a particular day for the observance of them. We have the same evidence, that they were all attended to on that day. As an example of this, see 1 Cor. v. 4. discipline; ch. xi. 20. Lord's supper; ch. xiv. 23. and other parts of the chapter, exhortation, prayer, praise, and that the meeting was public; ch. xvi. 2. the day and fellowship. Indeed, the first day of the week, which is consecrated to the memory of the resurrection of Jesus, and therefore in itself most proper to celebrate his victory in every act of social duty, is the only day in which all Christians *must* meet, and in which they all *can* meet, except as prevented by some providential occurrence. It cannot then be lawful for them either to omit or to exclude from that day, the public observance of any of the ordinances. They will therefore observe them all. And in attending to these as within their reach, the social union of the brethren advances to its most perfect state. Thus the proper means are used for discovering the best gifts and qualifications among them for ruling and serving; and when in connexion with the means, prayers are offered to the Lord for pastors and deacons, there is not the smallest reason to doubt that these will soon be found. But if the institutions of Jesus are not observed; if the gifts of the brethren are not called into action; if one man only is employed as the speaker through the whole of the Lord's day; and if one mode of instruction, which is seldom attainable, except men have been regularly trained to it, exclusively assumes the name of preaching, the obtaining of pastors, as has been observed, in the

churches themselves, becomes impracticable, and the education afforded by seminaries, instead of being subservient to the cause of truth, as it might be in a very high degree, is rendered an indispensable preliminary to the pastoral character. How much this must operate to hinder the gospel from having free course, it is easy to perceive. Many of the brethren may at present have all the qualifications of a bishop, described by Paul, and yet be for ever excluded from rendering, in that character, any service to the church of God. Besides, the increase of churches must, in this way, be altogether limited by the number of preachers that can be educated for the service; and churches of long standing, where there are many aged and experienced disciples, must frequently choose for their overseers young men, whose experience is far from being matured; who, in the mean time, might have been very usefully employed in the vineyard in some other way; but who, being prematurely brought forward into situations, for which they are as yet by no means qualified, find it very prejudicial to themselves, while it is ruinous to the churches.

As soon as it is in the power of the brethren, they will see it to be their duty to support their pastors. Till this be the case, the pastors should labour like those at Ephesus, both for themselves and to assist others. From the beginning of the association, rooms, or places to meet in, should be procured, large enough for the church, and those who will attend with them: and the accommodation for meeting ought to be enlarged, from time to time, as far as may be necessary and practicable. Their means will in this way go before their expences; they will be saved from many temptations, and be prevented from becoming dependent on others, as is always the case where this order is reversed. Thus, in fol-

lowing scriptural order, the churches of Christ, while they hold forth the word of life, wherever they are found, will cease to encounter those obstacles from their external arrangements, which at present tend so much to prevent their increase. Nor will their attention be confined to the vicinity in which their lot is cast, but as far as in them lies, they will exert themselves to diffuse every where the knowledge of the gospel; for in this, as in other respects, they will imitate the recorded zeal and example of the first churches. They will therefore send, or assist other churches in sending out brethren, properly qualified, to preach the gospel; using every means, when necessary, in the way of previously affording them instruction, to increase their aptness to teach.

Here it is of importance to determine, in what light any brother, thus sent out, is to be viewed by those who, through his means, may receive the truth.

He will not surely be considered as possessing the office of Timothy and Titus. He can shew no commission from an apostle to the churches, nor any authority delegated to appoint elders among them, and afterwards to superintend both them and their elders, rebuking the latter before all, when they do wrong; which the evangelists, being fully qualified for it by the laying on of the apostle's hands, were to do "with all authority." He will not then claim the character of an evangelist, more than of an apostle. The possession of the last of these offices was proved by miracles, that of the former by a personal commission, neither of which he can exhibit. For as one church possesses no power over another, it is clear, that any church giving such a commission, would be imparting more power to others, than they themselves possess, which is impossible. The person they send out, however, can do all that is necessary.

He can put the Scriptures into the hands of those to whom he comes, telling them, that these being completed, the will of God to man is fully revealed; that the extraordinary offices, for which men were qualified by the gifts of the Sprit, have now ceased; and that of course it has become competent for the disciples, wherever such may be, to arrange and conduct themselves in all respects according to the Scriptures of truth, by which they shall be judged at the last day. He will be ready to give them his best advice, and to help them with all the fruit of his experience, to which, if in a proper spirit, they will attentively listen; but they and he will transgress the rule to call no man father, if, in virtue of his connexion with the church from which he went out, or on any other pretence, he shall *command* them, or they shall *obey* him, as vested with the *authority* of an evangelist or an apostle. The rule he brings, has indeed the same authority as they possessed; but none of this authority, which was vested in them, is committed to him, any more than to those to whom the truth has now come; and besides, in his interpretation he is fallible as well as they. This cannot be admitted in regard to the injunctions of Timothy and Paul, otherwise the churches were, or might have been misled by those who carried divine credentials, see 1 Cor. iv. 17. It may here be observed, that it is the duty of every believer, by whatever providential means he finds himself in any place, to do all in his power, like Apollos, or the disciples scattered from Jerusalem, to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation, and to act exactly in the same manner as those who have been sent out by churches. Of this we have a remarkable instance in Acts iv. 19. &c., recognized and approved by the church under the inspection of the apostles at Jerusalem; for when Barnabas arrived at Antioch, he found a flourish-

ing church of Christ, which he rejoiced to see, and only exhorted to continue stedfast. Sometimes, when the Popish distinction of believers into clergymen and laymen is made, it is asked, who authorized the latter to preach the gospel? It may be asked in reply, who authorized the former? Pastors are appointed to rule and feed a particular church; and little or nothing is said about their preaching to the world, any more than of the other brethren. The title to preach to the world then, must be made out by the former, exactly in the same way as by the latter. The title and the duty of both, as they have opportunity and ability, is perfectly good, and perfectly equal.

It may now be proper to take notice of some objections that are made to the order of the churches above described. I begin with the observance of the Lord's supper in the absence of pastors, the propriety of which is doubted by many. But what peculiarity has yet been pointed out in this ordinance, which warrants us to conceive of it as possessing an exclusive sanctity, on account of which we should act differently in regard to it from all the rest? And what is said in Scripture of the nature of the pastoral office, which should lead us to suppose, that the presence of pastors is necessary to give validity to one ordinance more than to another? Is there any thing indescribable or mysterious conveyed by ordination? Or is the latter any thing more than simply appointment to office? Pastors are never spoken of in the Scriptures as priests, nor as the successors of apostles or evangelists. In them we see no more than the presidents of the Christian assembly, chosen according to their appointment to lead and to rule by the word of God, because by their knowledge of the Scriptures, and the weight of their character, they are the fittest among the brethren for this important work.

In the absence of pastors, however, it is said, that we have no example in Scripture, of the churches observing the Lord's supper. On the other hand, we have no information, in the instances recorded, that pastors were present. But if direct proof of its observance without them be deemed necessary, why is not the same required in regard to the other ordinances? Here it stands on a footing with all the rest. We know there were churches before there were pastors, and in the nature of the case it could not be otherwise. Churches from the beginning must have attended to several of the ordinances, without which we cannot conceive of their existence at all. They must have met on the Lord's day, and engaged in prayer, praise, and the exercise of discipline, in maintaining order and receiving additions to their number. But if they were thus employed in the affairs of Christ's kingdom, in celebrating his resurrection from the dead, and in his name approaching to the throne of grace, what reason can be given why they should not have commemorated his dying love? I am fully aware of the importance of the pastoral office, and that pastors, as soon as they are chosen, ought to preside in every part of social worship. I am convinced, that there ought to be no delay on the part of any church, in appointing such, after they can be obtained; but till that be the case, what reason can be given why one of the ordinances should be singled out from the rest, and set aside, which is much less difficult in its nature than others that are observed, and in which the want of pastors will be much less felt? There are some who contend against this view of the subject, who, notwithstanding, are satisfied with the presence of pastors from other churches. But if it be indispensable to the right observance of the Lord's supper, that pastors preside, (we hear nothing of their *dis-*

pensing the ordinance) it must certainly be in that church only to which they belong; for to such only their office is relative. We are too apt to detach the pastor of a church, from the church itself; but this should not be done. They are a part of the body, out of which they arise, and for which they officially exist. In this, as in other respects, they differ from the apostles and evangelists, who, on the contrary, gave rise to the churches, and settled their order. In short, if we would conceive of pastors, as we do of deacons, in their different services, we should, I presume, have a just idea of their office. The appointment too of elders and deacons, should certainly be conducted in the same manner; and the presence of elders or deacons from other churches, in this service, cannot be necessary; for neither of them can act officially, but in the society to which they belong. It is needless to notice the inconsistency of any, who, entertaining the views in question, are satisfied with the presence of those who were formerly pastors, but who no longer possess that character. On the whole, there is certainly an error working at bottom in respect to the pastoral office, and the Lord's supper. The idea of something mysterious, as has been observed, attaches to them. There was a real mystery in the priesthood, and also in the passover; but all that is intended by the two other ordinances, is plainly revealed. It may here be proper to add the early testimony of Tertullian, on this subject. He observes, that the distinction among Christians, between the priesthood and the people, is of the church's making; and then says, where there are none of the ecclesiastical order, the people may observe the Lord's supper, and baptize. When we consider the superstitious ideas which before then prevailed respecting the Lord's sup-

per, this must be considered as a very strong testimony to original practice.

Objections have also been made to the publicity of discipline. But what proof has ever been adduced to shew, that we are authorized to exclude the world from any of the ordinances of Christ? For this we have no authority from Scripture. A church of Christ is the pillar and ground of the truth, in its very nature a public body, designed to reflect the glory of God, and to exhibit the kingdom of Jesus Christ; intended both to provide for the security of his subjects, and the extension of his authority. All his ordinances are calculated, in their different ways, to be subservient to these important ends. Thus the discipline of the church proclaims his holiness; his authority, in putting away; and his love and mercy, in restoring offenders. In all its various exercises, it embodies his doctrine. What then can authorize the exclusion of any from this most profitable ordinance? In the Scriptures, we find the evils of churches, and the public offences even of apostles, and the manner in wh ch they were dealt with, brought forward fully to view. For we must allow that they are made public, unless, with the Roman Catholics, we shut up the Scriptures. And indeed their practice, in this respect, appears to be just as defensible, as ours in regard to discipline; or as that of the church of England, in shutting out all strangers from the Lord's supper. Exactly on the same principle as in the New Testament, the whole of the discipline of the Old, appointed by God for his ancient people, was conducted. Strangers had free access to dwell among them; yet matters of discipline, of the most delicate nature, and the most trying to their feelings, were managed with the greatest publicity. The only plea of any consequence, that is used for secret

discipline, is the tenderness due to brethren when they transgress. But let us not affect to carry our compassion beyond scriptural example; in attending to which, we shall in every respect "follow after charity." An error of this kind often pervades, not only our manner in the concealment of discipline, but sometimes also the way in which we conduct it. Is it not frequently urged, that in judging of a case, we should lean to the merciful side? We ought, however, to remember, that every ordinance of Christ is healing and salutary, and that the truest compassion is shewn, in adherence to the precise rule of his directions. Besides, the feelings of an offending brother should be directed into another channel than that of dreading the censure of the world. He should be taught, that in such circumstances it is a small matter to be judged of them. And he ought to be forward, publicly to remove the stumbling-block out of their way, which, when things are come this length, must in general have been thrown before them: while he is at the same time reminded, that if the church is acting in obedience to the laws of Christ, he is standing at his tribunal. Some contend, that it answers all the purposes of dicipline, if we exhibit it only in its effects. But this is far from being the case. A member of a church sins before the world. He is privately rebuked by his brethren, and professes repentance. The world had witnessed the sin, and they observe his continued fellowship with the church; but they do not know, at least as far as the church can prevent it, what confession or reparation he has made, and on what principles he is retained. Thus they are offended, and exclaim, that these people are no better than themselves! Here, then, considerations come in, that are paramount to any thing personal to the offender; see 2 Cor. vii. 12. The character of the church must be

vindicated, and the holiness of the gospel exhibited, in order that the foolishness of wicked men may be silenced. Even the good of the offender is in this way best secured.

The conclusive argument, however, is, that we find no intimation in Scripture of any exception, in regard to publicity, made with respect to this ordinance, any more than regarding its being attended to on the Lord's day. In observing discipline after a scriptural manner, there will be little or no discussion; if all cases be properly matured by the eldership, and every word "*established*" before it be brought to the church, for then nothing remains but the application of the law, about which there will seldom be any dispute, if the Scriptures be closely appealed to. This, among others, is one great end of the appointment of an eldership; for where there is only one pastor, this important part of the service cannot be performed nearly so well, as where there is a plurality to deliberate. Other things of importance, respecting open discipline, might be mentioned; such as the advantages of exhibiting the nature of the association fully to those who wish to join the church, &c., as well as to those of other denominations. The weight of discipline too, if executed by the whole church, and not by a partial meeting, is of much consequence.

It is unnecessary, I presume, to say any thing in support of exhortation and prayer by the brethren on the Lord's day. Whoever reads the epistles with attention, will observe, that they are addressed to the churches as associated bodies, and not as individuals. Unless we attend to this, we shall frequently mistake the sense, and fall far short of the meaning. Some expressions, indeed, are necessarily limited to persons of a certain description in the church, such as those in which masters and servants, husbands and wives, are addressed;

but with such exceptions, which point out themselves, we ought undoubtedly to understand all the directions of the apostles to be given to the church *as a body*, otherwise we lose their most extensive meaning. In short, we must consider their addresses as directed to believers in every situation, in which they are applicable; both when acting in association, and when acting as individuals. In this view of their epistles, we enter into their full meaning, while by the common view that is taken of them, they are miserably mutilated. And into such a mistake, all those who are connected with worldly societies, where the apostolic precepts cannot be acted on as a body, necessarily fall. For whatever part of the word of God, we do not habitually obey, we soon come to misunderstand; and it is only in the way of obedience, that Jesus manifests himself to us in the increase of knowledge, as well as in other things. Believers then, in such situations, perceiving at once the absurdity of expecting, that a body of people, not united in the truth, should act in subjection to these rules, find that they cannot be attended to by themselves, *in their association*, and therefore they never think of them in this light, and of course they turn their attention to them, only as they apply to themselves, or to others, in their individual character. Thus, much of their force is lost, and a partial obedience only is rendered. But apostolic churches have no temptation to garble the word of God. These ought to have their eyes open to every part of the precious record; and in this, as in all other respects, in the keeping of his commandments, there will be a great reward. Ye are the *epistle*, says Paul, not *epistles*. Ye are the *temple*, not *temples*. Examine yourselves, that is, as a body know ye not, that Christ is in you, except ye be without proof, that is, of obedience to the things I have been

enjoining; but however this may be, we are not without proof of having the office, and consequent authority of apostles committed to us; which, with one or two digressions, is the subject of the whole second epistle to the Corinthians. The meaning of the 5th verse of the 13th chapter, is analogous to that of the 11th, which must be understood in that way; while the last undoubtedly comprehends under it the common meaning affixed, of personal and individual examination, which was also necessary to the purity of the whole. Phil. ii. 15. Shine ye as the luminaries, if properly understood, is no exception. Let these remarks be attended to, when we read the precepts respecting prayer, exhortation, or comforting one another, and we shall fully understand their import. And if these consequently be social ordinances, then there can be no doubt that we are not, on any ground whatever, entitled to exclude them, more than any other social observance from the Lord's day; on which we are to do every thing that respects the service of the house of God. Exhortation by the brethren, it may be observed, is the most effectual means of maintaining purity of doctrine, from which one or two, placed in a particular situation in the church, may more readily swerve than the whole body; for if many, in different situations in the church, be engaged in this service, it will tend to counteract errors, as well as mutually to refresh and instruct. To confirm this, let it be observed, that the whole body, and not the pastors detached from their brethren, are constituted by the apostles, the depositaries of the truth. How much will this arrangement also increase the ability of the church, to hold forth the word of life; for by this means, the talents of all will be employed and improved, who will occasionally go forth in every direction, proclaiming the word of life. The remarkable

success of the Highland churches, whose members are all exhorters, is a very strong confirmation to us on this subject. I would only add, let not pastors be jealous, lest their labours and office should by this means be superseded. It will be far otherwise. For, on the contrary, as the church increases in knowledge and usefulness, the value and necessity of their services will be more and more perceived. Nor let them be tempted by any lurking fears of detriment to their temporal interests. In this, as in other parts of their obedience, they must walk by faith; but they may be assured, that if they do so, great will be their reward in heaven: and if they seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, all other things, even in this present life, will be added unto them.

It is often objected to the order above recommended, that if it should be adopted, numbers who at present attend on the preaching of the gospel will withdraw. Although this may happen in particular places, I am fully persuaded, that the effect on the whole would be very different. For in this way there would be no limitation, as is fixed by our present order, to the extension of the gospel all over the country, and lights would be set up in every corner where there are disciples. Besides, were the congregation in any place diminished, much more good might still be expected to result to those who remained, from the full scriptural exhibition of all the ordinances, than from the partial manner in which they are at present observed; for there is not one of them which is not highly calculated to make that deep impression on the human heart, noticed in 1 Cor. xiv. 25. This is a question, however, that is not to be determined by our conjectures either the one way or the other. Usefulness is indeed a great object. It can never be lost sight of, while we retain either the love

of God or of man. But it must be followed in the way of duty. In few things does the weakness of our faith discover itself more than with respect to usefulness. We know and feel its importance. We pursue it therefore with ardour and zeal. But this zeal is not always according to knowledge. In order to attain it, we are apt to hew out cisterns for ourselves, to forsake the path of duty, and to seek it by another road. Thus we reverse the scriptural rule of walking by faith, and not by sight. God's method in the Scriptures, of reclaiming sinners, does not appear to us the best, or at least the best adapted to our time and circumstances, and we substitute one of our own devising, to which perhaps we have been accustomed, or which we have observed to be practised by others who are esteemed the most excellent of the earth. We see too that good is effected by them, and this, combined with the weight of their characters, appears irresistible. But we never ought to suffer ourselves to be deceived in this manner. No appearances whatever should have any weight with us, except as confirmed by the faithful record. To the law and to the testimony. From them we must set out, and to the test of these all things must be brought. Obedience is better than sacrifice. Good, it is admitted, may be expected to be done, as far as the means of God's appointment are used; but then in proportion as any human devices are introduced, in so far evil, though unperceived, will accompany the good, and the former may outweigh the latter. At all events we must not do evil that good may come. Whenever this is attempted, it proves great ignorance of the nature of Christ's kingdom, and of the strength of his government. To support these our little policy is not needed. And the more knowledge we have, the more inexcusable we are

in such deviations, and the less reason have we to expect that they will succeed. Our way then is plain, to search the Scriptures, and to follow them wherever they lead. Far be it from us to be indifferent about consequences, but we must leave them in the hand of God.

The good effects that may be expected to result from right order appear very obvious. In attending thereto churches begin at the foundation by providing for their own increased edification. It is worthy of particular regard that this was the manner of all the apostles. Observe the uniform strain of their epistles to the churches. The whole force of their instructions and exhortations is directed to promote the edification of the brethren. Scarcely one word is said respecting their duty to aim at the conversion of the world. Were the apostles then indifferent about this? The furthest from it possible. This the whole tenor of their lives attests. But acting under the immediate influence of the Holy Ghost, they well knew that the shortest and most successful method of accomplishing that great end, was to bring the churches into the best possible state, who, following out the principles they had inculcated, would imitate their example in laborious and unwearied zeal for the good of others. It was in this way on the whole, that matters were conducted during the first three centuries, in which time the gospel flourished more, and extended itself faster, than ever it has done since that period.

According to the scriptural mode of proceeding, the means of grace would be brought near to multitudes who at present are excluded from them. For believers finding that in whatever situation they might be placed, or however small in number, they were not debarred

P. 14. last line, *after* letter *add* on which he builds so much
31. l. 2. *for* the case is reversed, *read* it recoils upon himself,
40. 13. from bottom, *for* cause *read* account
43. 8. from bottom, *for* fourth *read* third
65. 2. *for* conditions *read* nature and conditions
65. 7. after sent *add* next day
65. 20. *for* Thursday *read* Wednesday
75. 8. *for* which *read* who
86. 10. from bottom, *for* of his *read* to his

LIBRARY RULES

1. **No book may be taken from the library without being charged to the borrower.** Borrowers are responsible for any damage done to the volumes while in their possession and are expected to make good all losses.
2. (a) **Reserve Books** may be borrowed for a period of two hours. In case no call has been made in the interval, books may be renewed for a second two hours. (Where there is only one copy, book must be used in the library.)

   (b) Reserve books taken at 10 p. m. Mondays to Fridays are due at 9 a. m. the next morning. A reserve book taken from the library at 12 m. Saturday is due at 9 a. m. the following Monday.
3. Books not on reserve may be drawn from the library for two weeks and may be renewed once for the same period, except one-day books.
4. A fine of two cents a day will be charged on each book which is not returned according to the above rule.
5. MAGAZINES ARE NOT to be taken from the library without the special permission of the librarian.

LY73
H12

19768